FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-182
Thursday
21 September 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-182 *21 September 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Korniyenko Criticizes U.S. Approach to Arms Talks *[PRAVDA 18 Sep]* 1
Baker Statement on Land-Based Missiles Viewed *[Kuznetsov on Moscow International]* 3
Canberra Conference Seeks Ban of 'Toxic Agents' *[TASS]* 4

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

E. Bloc Parties Suffer Decline in Membership *[PRAVDA 18 Sep]* 5
Warsaw Pact Representatives Meet 19-20 Sep *[TASS]* 6
Conference Held on 'Socialist Ownership' *[PRAVDA 14 Sep]* 6

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Conducts 20 Sep News Briefing 7
Denies Arms Supplies to Nicaraugua *[TASS]* 7
Comments on Afghan Rebel Drug Trafficking *[TASS]* 7
Favors Hungarian Border Proposal *[Budapest Radio]* 7
Welcomes Baker Statement on ICBM's *[TASS]* 7
Expresses Concern on Namibia Situation *[TASS]* 8
Notes Eagleburger Remarks on Reform *[TASS]* 8
More on News Briefing *[IZVESTIYA 20 Sep]* 8
TASS Rounds Up Briefing *[TASS]* 9
Petrovskiy Meets With Perez de Cuellar *[TASS]* 10
IAEA Opens Vienna Meeting on Nuclear Cooperation *[TASS]* 10

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze in U.S. for Talks With Bush, Baker 11
Comments on Plenum, U.S. Trip *[Moscow TV]* 11
Makes Departure Statement *[TASS]* 11
Brings 'Interesting Proposals' *[TASS]* 12
U.S. Expected To Seek More Soviet 'Concessions' *[PRAVDA 20 Sep]* 12
TASS Cites Baker on Upcoming Wyoming Meeting 13

China

'Tree of Friendship' With PRC Deeply Rooted *[Moscow International]* 14
PRC Anti-Bourgeois Measures Continue, Detailed *[IZVESTIYA 10 Sep]* 14

Northeast Asia

Japan-Soviet Deputy Ministerial Meeting Held *[Moscow International]* 15
South Korean Leader's 'Community' Plan Cited *[IZVESTIYA 12 Sep]* 16
Belousov Meets, Sees Off DPRK Premier 8 Sep *[PRAVDA 9 Sep]* 16

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Government Responds to Bhutto Statements *[TASS]* 16
Reporters Back Afghan Rebuttal of BBC, VOA *[PRAVDA 16 Sep]* 17
Afghan Rebel's Situation, Setbacks Described *[PRAVDA 19 Sep]* 17
Najibullah Speech, Afghan Situation Reported *[TASS]* 18

Andreyev Comments on Syrian-Iranian Relations *[Moscow International]* 19
Envoy to Damascus Discusses Soviet-Syrian Ties *[TASS]* 20
Egypt's Document on Palestinian Problem Explained *[PRAVDA 19 Sep]* 20
Mubarak Plan Said To Split Israeli Government *[IZVESTIYA 19 Sep]* 21
Moscow TV Interviews Jerusalem Mayor Kollek 21
Reported Israeli Missile Launch Draws Reactions
[Kushnir on Moscow Radio Peace and Progress] 23
Shevardnadze Message to Omani Minister of State *[Muscat Radio]* 23

Sub-Saharan Africa

Progress of Carter-Sponsored Ethiopia Talks Noted *[IZVESTIYA 19 Sep]* 23
South African President's Promises Evaluated *[Asoyan on Moscow International]* 24
Further Commentary on De Klerk *[Fedorov on Moscow International]* 25

East Europe

Demonstrations Mark Polish Partition Anniversary *[IZVESTIYA 19 Sep]* 25
Komsomol Condemns Anti-Soviet Attitude *[Warsaw PAP]* 26
Party Renewal, Problems Debated at PZPR Plenum *[IZVESTIYA 20 Sep]* 26
PZPR Aide Queried on Restructuring of Party *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 37]* 27
First Steps of Polish Cabinet Scrutinized *[PRAVDA 18 Sep]* 28

West Europe

Former Aide to Shevardnadze Said To Defect in Rome *[AFP]* 29
Two Members of Soviet Weightlifting Team Defect *[TASS]* 29
23 Sep Gorbachev-Thatcher Meeting Reviewed *[TASS]* 30
French Communist Party's Marchais Interviewed *[PRAVDA 20 Sep]* 30
Italy's Prime Minister Andreotti on Perestroyka *[MOSCOW NEWS No 38]* 34
TASS Reports Emigration of Pontic Greeks 34

Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaraguan Defense Minister on Arms Aid Halt *[TASS]* 35
'Announcement' on Nicaraguan Delegation's Visit *[IZVESTIYA 17 Sep]* 36

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

'Major Reshuffle' in Party Bodies Reported *[TASS]* 38
Biographies of New Politburo Members Noted 38
Kryuchkov Elected *[TASS]* 38
Maslyukov Promoted *[TASS]* 38
Biographies of Candidate Politburo Members Reported 39
Primakov Elected *[TASS]* 39
Pugo Elected *[TASS]* 39
Gorbachev's Closing Speech at Plenum Broadcast *[Moscow TV]* 39
Comparison of Gorbachev Speech Opening Party Plenum *[PRAVDA 20 Sep]* 42
Comparison of Gorbachev's Nationalities Report *[TASS]* 42
Plenum Adopts Platform on Nationalities Policy *[TASS]* 43
Discusses Interethnic 'Hot Spots' *[TASS]* 43
Further Reportage on 20 Sep Plenum Proceedings 44
Day Two Plenum Speakers Listed *[PRAVDA 21 Sep]* 44
Speeches From 20 Sep CPSU Plenum Reported 45
Bakatin Speaks on Interethnic Crime *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Azerbaijan's Vezirov on Ethnic Relations *[Moscow Radio]* 46
Volskiy Urges 'Restraint' in NKAO *[Moscow TV]* 47
Tajikistan's Makhkamov on Self-Government *[Moscow Radio]* 47
Smolensk's Vlasenko on Interethnic Issues *[Moscow Radio]* 47
Shirshin, Mishin on Nationalities Problems *[Moscow Radio]* 48

Further Reportage on 19 Sep CPSU Plenum Speeches 49
Arutyunyan Appeals for 'Compromise' on NKAO *[Moscow TV]* 49
Vyalyas Addresses Baltic Situation *[Moscow TV]* 49
Moldavia's Grossu Says 'Strength Is In Union' *[Moscow TV]* 50
More 19 Sep CPSU Plenum Speeches Reported *[TASS]* 50
PRAVDA Apologizes to Yeltsin for Reprint Story *[21 Sep]* 68
Supreme Soviet Plans Investigation *[TASS]* 68
PRAVDA's Afanasyev Interviewed on Glasnost *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Sep]* 69
Time Set for Supreme Soviet Opening *[Moscow Radio]* 71
Transcaucusus Pipeline Explodes; No Fatalities *[TASS]* 71
Report Released on 3 Jun Pipeline Explosion *[TASS]* 72
Internal Affairs Supply Problems Reported *[TASS]* 72
Measures Taken To Ease Soap Shortage Detailed *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 72
RSFSR Nationalities Commission Begins Work *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Sep]* 73
Blockade at Yerevan Railroad Station Continues *[Yerevan Radio]* 73
'Deteriorating' NKAO Economy Noted *[Yerevan Radio]* 74
NKAO Committee, Armenian Attitudes Assailed *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 23 Aug]* 74
Lithuanian Communists To Submit Program Outline *[Vilnius International]* 75
Latvian Academic Queried on Financial Autonomy *[Moscow Radio]* 76
Baltic Border Guards Field Criticism *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Sep]* 76
Kazakh Presidium Hits Baltic 'Separatist' Views *[KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Sep]* 79
Tajik Official on Readiness for 'Concessions' *[Moscow TV]* 79
Tajik KGB Party Meeting Held *[KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA 8 Sep]* 80

Scientific

'Mir' Scientists Complete Second Week of Tests *[Moscow Radio]* 81
Kuybyshev Space Launch Design Bureau Visited
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 14 Sep] 81
Need for Uzbek Nuclear Waste Plant Defended *[PRAVDA 4 Sep]* 82

Military

Military Helicopter Crashes in Uzbekistan *[TASS]* 83
Yazov, Ligachev on Coping With Military Change *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Sep]* 83
Defense Official Discusses 'Afghan Lesson' *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 86
Military, Party Officials Meet in Transcaucasus *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 30 Aug]* 88
Defense Ministry Lists Articles for Civilian Use *[Moscow International]* 88

Korniyenko Criticizes U.S. Approach to Arms Talks

PM2009112189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Sep 89 Second Edition p 7

[G. Korniyenko article: "Scarcity of Good Will. What Is Hindering a Fundamental Breakthrough at the Disarmament Talks"]

[Text]Fall sees the end of the vacations not only for schoolchildren and students. Many diplomatic talks also resume at this time, including those on questions of arms control and disarmament. Thus the latest round of talks between the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries on reducing armed forces and arms in Europe began in Vienna 7 September. The Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms are to resume in Geneva 25 September, to be followed by the talks on nuclear tests.

In this connection it seems expedient to sum up not so much what was done in the previous rounds of talks as what was not done and why. And the chief thing is to think about what is necessary to achieve a fundamental shift in the cause of disarmament.

As is known, the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee Bucharest Conference pointed out that the additional proposals on conventional armed forces and arms in Europe advanced at the Brussels session of the NATO Council go some way toward meeting the allied socialist countries' position, and it confirmed the latter's determination to do everything possible for the speediest achievement of positive results at the Vienna talks.

Indeed, the United States and NATO as a whole have finally gotten away from their former position at those talks, according to which only arms such as tanks, artillery, and armored cars would be subject to reduction—primarily those types of which the Warsaw Pact countries have more—while strike aircraft and combat helicopters, of which the NATO countries have considerably more, would not be affected at all, and the number of troops generally would not be limited. It is, of course, good that NATO has gotten away from such an unrealistic and even simply frivolous position.

However, as the Vienna talks show, many one-sided elements still remain in the NATO countries' present position: There are continuing attempts to remove from restrictions certain types of arms of which the NATO countries have more and, conversely, to include those of which the Warsaw Pact countries have more, even though they are of a purely defensive nature, like antiaircraft fighters, and there is a desire not to limit the number of troops—including those stationed outside national borders—of NATO countries other than the United States.

Without now going deeply into the specifics of the remaining disagreements in Vienna—this is a matter for the talks participants—it has to be acknowledged that NATO's fundamental approach to the problem of military confrontation in Europe, unlike the Warsaw Pact countries' approach, has remained unchanged. This is accounted for by saying that "from the moment it came into being the alliance of Western democracies has had defensive aims," and so the need does not arise for NATO to make any substantial changes to its military planning; the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact alone must do this, so it turns out.

As a natural response to such arguments I could repeat for the 1,000th time the same thing about the Warsaw Pact's defensive aims, also pointing out that this pact itself was concluded as a countermeasure 6 years after the formation of NATO.

But the exchange of such arguments has gone on for decades, has gotten us nowhere, and can hardly advance us now. Even if the sides' mutual assurances that they have no aggressive intentions are doubly sincere, neither side will rely on these assurances any more than the other if and as long as it sees that the other has the ability to carry out large-scale offensive actions. A clear-cut formula in this regard has long been established in the NATO vocabulary, for example: **It is not intentions but military capabilities that are of real significance**.

Today even nonmilitary specialists realize that "nonoffensive defense," whereby the composition, structure, positioning, and other parameters of one side's armed forces, purely objectively—that is, regardless of its intentions at any given moment—cannot arouse in the other side any fears of the possibility of a sudden attack on it, is one thing. Whereas it is quite another thing when the armed forces of one or other side or of both sides are organized—as a whole or in a certain region—proceeding from the principle that "attack is the best means of defense."

In the latter case the other side cannot be sure that under certain circumstances the actually existing offensive potential will not be used for purposes that are not at all defensive, but for an attack on it.

Of course, statements are frequently made in the West that NATO has never had more troops and weapons than are necessary for defense—that is, that NATO, unlike the Warsaw Pact, has always adhered and adheres now precisely to the principle of "nonoffensive defense." Now, they say, it is up to the Warsaw Pact countries—they alone must alter their concepts and, accordingly, reduce both troops and armaments far more.

At the same time not only the data at the Soviet side's disposal but also authoritative Western sources show very clearly the flimsiness of attempts to depict the matter as though NATO's armed forces, unlike the Warsaw Pact's, are organized in keeping with the concept of "nonoffensive defense."

Let us take, for example, the report published 12 September 1988 by the House Armed Services Committee of the U.S. Congress. That report prepared on the basis of

evidence from high-ranking CIA and U.S. State Department officials and other U.S. governmental and nongovernmental experts analyzes the correlation of forces between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, compares their military doctrines, and examines the prospects for reducing military confrontation in Europe.

After pointing out that in the military-technical sphere the Warsaw Pact armed forces have hitherto been built proceeding from the principle that "the best defense is counteroffensive," the report's authors go on to say, without beating about the bush: "NATO's armed forces also reflect the concept that 'the best defense is a good offensive.'" As we see, the U.S. legislators did not feel too shy to characterize the NATO concept of defense as meaning the capability not even for a counteroffensive, as in the case of the Warsaw Pact, but simply for **a good offensive**—which does not rule out inflicting a "preventive" strike.

It was with regard to just this conclusion that the report's authors spoke pessimistically of the possibility of counting on unilateral steps by the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact countries to restructure their armed forces according to the principle of "nonoffensive defense" "as long as the NATO forces preserve their present configuration."

As is known, the U.S. legislators' pessimistic judgments in this regard were not confirmed—less than 3 months after the publication of their report the Soviet Union and then the other Warsaw Pact countries announced major steps to restructure and reduce their armed forces and are already implementing them unilaterally in practice. At the same time they proposed a broad program of mutual reductions of Warsaw Pact and NATO arms and armed forces and of structural changes so that **both** are brought fully into line with the defensive nature of the military doctrines declared by both military alliances.

Thus, there is a fundamental difference in the approaches of the Warsaw Pact and NATO to the problem of surmounting military confrontation in Europe. The Warsaw Pact countries are ready not in words but in deeds (their "advance" in the form of unilateral steps is the guarantee of this) mutually to eliminate inconsistencies between the military-technical parts of the two alliances' military doctrines and their political elements and defensive thrust. Meanwhile, the NATO countries, while being forced to make some moves on practical questions (which in itself is good), are still not displaying readiness, as can be seen both from the Brussels documents and from the Vienna talks, to approach honestly and in a really new way the revision of the conceptual basis of their policy on questions of military building and disarmament in Europe.

This is manifested particularly graphically in the positions of the governments of the United States and a number of other NATO countries on the question of tactical nuclear weapons (range up to 500 km) in Europe. It is known that, on encountering sharply negative sentiments in the majority of West European countries with regard to the plans to modernize and build up these kinds of weapons there, the United States has not insisted on the adoption right now of a final decision on this question within the NATO framework—it has been deferred until 1992. But it also refuses to discuss with the Warsaw Pact countries the question of tactical nuclear weapons until an agreement on conventional arms has been drawn up and signed and has begun to be implemented. At the same time it gives advance warning that it can agree to embark on a certain possible reduction in U.S. tactical nuclear weapons (and only U.S. weapons, as though the other NATO countries did not have such weapons) only after the reductions of conventional arms have been completed, while the reductions in analogous Soviet nuclear systems, to its mind, "must be implemented before that date." In addition, it has been confirmed that the work in the United States on creating a new missile with a range of more than 400 km to replace the present Lance missile (120 km) will meanwhile be continued.

And all this is happening at the same time as the Soviet Union is, right now, destroying all its SS-23 missiles with a range of up to 500 km within the framework of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, even though formally they were not to come under the terms of that treaty, as M.S. Gorbachev reminded U.S. State Secretary J. Baker in conversation with him 11 May. At the same time he informed him that the USSR will unilaterally withdraw 500 tactical nuclear systems warheads from its allies' territory in 1989 and that it is prepared in general to withdraw all nuclear ammunition from its allies' territory during 1989-1991 on condition that the United States takes an analogous step in return.

At the Bucharest conference the Warsaw Pact states expressed satisfaction with the resumption of bilateral Soviet-U.S. talks on the most important areas of disarmament, declaring that they regard it as a priority aim to complete the drafting of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms under conditions of compliance with the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972.

If you approach the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms with just such a yardstick, can it be said that the sides are closer to concluding them successfully today than under the previous U.S. administration?

It must be regarded as a positive fact that the new administration has agreed, after thinking about it for almost 6 months, to continue the work on the talks in the sphere of strategic offensive arms from the point where they stopped at the end of last year, because things have happened differently in U.S. practice in the past. But still this fact indicates, at best, only that the sides have not gotten further away from completing the work, and not that they have gotten closer to it, particularly if you consider the time wasted thinking about it.

The United States has still not moved from its position, which virtually means that an entire class of strategic arms—long-range sea-launched cruise missiles—is freed from the restrictions under the treaty. The question of "air-to-surface" missiles also remains open, both with regard to the range of missiles to be subject to reduction and concerning the rules for counting them on heavy bombers.

If we are talking about the connection between strategic offensive arms reductions and compliance with the ABM Treaty, the present U.S. Administration's stand on this cardinal question has undergone a change, but certainly not for the better. Answering a journalist's question as to whether the United States considers it necessary to abide by the formula worked out in this regard at the highest level in Washington in December 1987, Richard Burt, head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, unambiguously declared: "The approach to the question of linkage or interdependence needs changing, and we are seeking the abandonment of such a linkage in order to hold independent talks on each of the problems."

This alone is sufficient to seriously jam the talks for a long time—which is what, in the opinion of a number of U.S. observers, the present administration is working toward.

G. Bush's administration has not, unfortunately, made any constructive changes to the U.S. stand on nuclear weapon tests either, although the Warsaw Pact states and also the USSR Supreme Soviet have again called for their full cessation without delay.

What is more, there are still delays even over agreeing the protocols on additional verification measures for the 1974 Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests to a 150-kiloton threshold and the 1976 Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes. Meanwhile, joint experiments conducted along both governmental and public lines by Soviet and U.S. scientists have left no doubts as to the possibility of effectively verifying [prokontrolirovat] not only the threshold limitations on underground nuclear explosions but also their total prohibition.

So, as we see, the matter is held up every time not by disagreements over particular details but by the sides' different fundamental approaches to the essence of the problem and by the presence or lack of political will.

This is the situation as it stands today. It confirms the conclusion drawn by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies that guarantees of the irreversibility of the positive changes begun in the spheres of disarmament and of strengthening confidence-building measures have not yet taken shape.

Such guarantees, it is to be supposed, can appear only when not only we but also our Western partners begin thinking in the new way, when they too proceed from the premise that security is indivisible and can be ensured exclusively by political means, and when they accordingly amend their positions on specific questions which are the subject of talks.

It is clear that we cannot sit with our arms folded and wait for those in the West themselves to mature until they understand all this. We must continue spurring them toward this by our vigorous, constructive actions.

Baker Statement on Land-Based Missiles Viewed

LD2009164189 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] United States Secretary of State James Baker said on Tuesday that the United States would drop its insistence on banning mobile land-based nuclear missiles if congress agreed to appropriate money for such weapons. The announcement was made to counter charges that the Bush Administration was unresponsive to opportunities presented by the policy of perestroyka, and was ambivalent in the area of arms control. More from our observer Pavel Kuznetsov.

According to reports from Washington, the announcement came amid rumors that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze might had a message from Mikhail Gorbachev to George Bush during their meeting in New York containing new Soviet proposals to advance the stalled negotiations on strategic arms. The talks are in a bad shape because of a logjam of problems. Among them, mobile land-based missiles are much less of a problem that whether there should be a limit on sea-launched cruise missiles or how to count air-launched cruise missiles. Another major issue is the American Star Wars program, or SDI. Testing of its components in space by the United States might kill the Soviet-American antiballistic missile treaty of 1972, and thus turn outer space into a free-for-all.

In short, moving ahead on one issue while holding back on many others may be a gesture to calm critics at home and in Western Europe, and persuade them that the Bush Administration does not regard this crucial area of Soviet-American relations as such a low priority after all. When Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Secretary of State James Baker meet in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, analysts expect them to announce several steps on such topics as an expanded human rights dialogue, an agreement on determining the chemical weapons stockpiles of each side, a protocol on verifying the nuclear threshold treaties of 1974 and 1976, and also closer cooperation in fighting terrorism and drug trafficking.

All this is fine and serious; but equally serious is the Cold War, fought occasionally by top Administration officials on the feelings and aspirations of those who are convinced that perestroyka is much more than a hard battle being fought out among the Soviets themselves. Let us not forget that generations of conservatives in this country were raised on a deadly Soviet-American rivalry.

Canberra Conference Seeks Ban of 'Toxic Agents'

LD2009221189 Moscow TASS in English 2058 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Canberra September 20 TASS—Five people were dying in terrible suffering. They had their lungs burnt. I will never forget the spectacle, Australian scientist Peter Dunn today told the participants in the international conference of government and industrial community representatives against chemical weapons. Dunn was a member of the U.N. Group who saw the death of the victims of toxic agents used during the Iran-Iraq conflict in 1987. He demonstrated to the conference delegates from 68 countries the photos of the dead people and those who became disabled through exposure to combat chemical agents, thus confirming the imperative necessity to remove all barriers in the way of banning this barbarous weapon of mass annihilation.

Today the conference participants split into working groups to discuss specific aspects of contributing to an early conclusion of a convention on a complete prohibition of production, use, stockpiling and storage of deadly toxic agents. The discussion has revealed the principal problems and apprehensions preventing the delegates from working out specific proposals. The U.S. delegate Richard Clark alleged, among other things, that complexity of verifying compliance with the convention on chemical weapons could prejudice the entire arms control structure.

Referring to measures being taken in the USSR to facilitate talks on the convention, head of the Soviet delegation N. Smidovich pointed out that the Soviet Union had already undertaken an experimental inspection at a factory in the city of Dzerzhinsk. The inspection proved that verification was possible. A procedure was being tested in the USSR to carry out verifications on request, which must become an obligatory form of international control under the convention. The Soviet Union believes that the openness concept must replace the traditional secrecy vis-a-vis chemical weapons, he said.

E. Bloc Parties Suffer Decline in Membership

PM2009145389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Candidate of Historical Sciences V. Vereshchagin, Candidate of Historical Sciences N. Rusanov, and Candidate of Economic Sciences Yu. Zvorygin under the rubric "Scientists Pose a Problem": "Who Joins the Party"]

[Text] Moscow—A conference of central committee secretaries for party organizational questions of the communist and workers parties of 12 socialist countries was held in Havana this summer. Problems of the fraternal parties' numerical and qualitative composition were at the center of attention.

The discussion of this topic was no accident. The point is that the serious difficulties of a socioeconomic and political nature which the socialist countries encountered in the early eighties have not yet been overcome. What is more, they have currently been greatly exacerbated in a number of countries. Growing inflation, which has had grave social consequences, the heavy burden of foreign debts, the unemployment that has arisen, disproportions in the economy, the lowering of working people's living standards, the exacerbation of tension in national relations—this is a far from full list of the problems which life has set a number of ruling communist and workers parties.

Naturally, all this has affected their prestige in society too. The internal unity of the parties under whose leadership the new society is being built has weakened. A slowing in the growth of party ranks or a reduction in their size, a fall in the proportion of representatives of the working class in them, and also a drop in the number of voters casting their votes for communists running for organs of power are to be observed in socialist countries—above all, where radical economic and political reforms are being implemented.

In recent years there has been a reduction in the size of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] and the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR], for example. This has happened not so much because of a drop in the number of people joining as because of, as a rule, people voluntarily leaving the party, including representatives of the working class. Thus, in September 1987 the MSZMP had 880,000 members, and now it has approximately 730,000. Recently, to judge from data published in the Hungarian party press, approximately 2,000 workers a month have been leaving the party.

What are the reasons for the declining membership of a number of ruling parties? It is, above all, people who disagree with their policy that are leaving them. On the one hand, they are people who oppose the resolute renewal of socialism. On the other, they are people who believe that the reforms are being implemented too slowly. For example, 12 percent of those who have left the MSZMP did not agree with the party line of having a multiparty system and restructuring political institutions.

Although the absolute number of members has been continuing to grow recently in a number of parties, nevertheless the rate of increase is beginning to fall. Such processes are characteristic of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV], and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party. For example, during 1987-1988 alone the admission of new members to the CPV fell 20 percent.

For all the fraternal parties the question of changing their social composition is particularly urgent today. The proportion of workers in party ranks has been falling in recent years. One of the reasons is, in particular, the discrepancy between the slogans proclaimed and real life. As a result, there is declining confidence in the party as the expresser of the working people's interests. Let us turn to the figures: The proportion of workers in the MSZMP stands at 39 percent. In the European socialist countries the number of workers exceeds 50 percent only in the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] and the Romanian Communist Party.

A similar situation is taking shape with regard to the age makeup of party members. The problem of "aging" and of the declining proportion of young people in the ranks of communists is topical today for practically all the fraternal parties. Thus, party members below the age of 30 make up less than 12 percent of the Bulgarian Communist Party, 8 percent of the MSZMP, and 6 percent of the PZPR.

How are these processes to be assessed? At first sight you get the impression that these problems result from the fraternal parties' falling prestige in a number of countries, a decline in their leading role in resolving very acute socioeconomic and political problems, and the discrepancy between the parties' interests and aims and the interests and aims both of party members and of the working masses. Indeed, all this is present in life to one degree or another. In our view, however, the declining size and changing composition of ruling parties stem from the fact that really pluralistic political relations have arisen in the socialist society but have not yet become settled. And the parties were not adequately prepared for changes of this kind.

The present difficulties were probably inevitable after the long domination of society by the administrative-edict system of management. Presumably these problems will deepen until the first positive results of the political and economic reforms being implemented under the leadership of communist and workers parties become obvious.

Questions of shaping their ranks demand new approaches from the socialist countries' communist and workers parties and decisions to democratize internal party life. Many fraternal parties are revising the former practice, on the one hand, of rigid centralized regulation

of the social composition and, on the other, of predetermined growth in the size of party ranks. Many people believe that the party's prestige must be strengthened not by means of a mass admission of workers but by admitting progressive representatives of all working people.

In this connection there is an acute debate on the question of who should be included among representatives of the working class. It is proposed to widen the framework of the concept of "the working class" and to get away from its oversimplified interpretation. Proposals are also being made for free departure from the party, without any consequences, and for the possibility of having a "floating" membership and of altering it in one direction or the other depending on the objective conditions in each party organization, and not on directive guidelines "from above."

Work aimed at strengthening the party's prestige among the masses is being developed in a new way. Its importance is to attract into the party young people, representatives of the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia, while at the same time excluding people who have compromised themselves, primarily those holding leading posts.

The center of gravity in the work on shaping the ranks is shifting to primary party organizations. Thus, in the MSZMP changes have been made to the statutes with regard to admission to the party. These changes have confirmed the sovereignty of primary organizations in deciding to admit new members and abolished the sanctioning powers of party committees.

With a view to enhancing the prestige of communists a number of parties are increasingly widely involving the nonparty masses in the discussion of questions of admission to their ranks. In the Communist Party of Cuba, the CPV, the SED, and a number of others the opinion of the labor collective is without fail taken into account when admitting every candidate party member.

Despite serious difficulties, the fraternal parties are looking with optimism to the future. On their own initiative the socialist countries' communist and workers parties are exposing problems, outlining ways to resolve them, and seeking to demonstrate their right under the new conditions to continue to be the leading force in socialist building.

Warsaw Pact Representatives Meet 19-20 Sep

LD2009164489 Moscow TASS in English 1632 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Sofia September 20 TASS—A working meeting of representatives of foreign ministries of Warsaw Treaty countries was held here on September 19-20. An exchange of opinions on the fundamental tendencies of the present and topical questions of the development of integrational processes in Europe took place.

The participants in the meeting were received by Ivan Ganev, deputy foreign minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

Conference Held on 'Socialist Ownership'

PM1909122589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Topical Problems"]

[Text] The international scientific conference "Diversity of forms of ownership and economic management and their interaction" has been held at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences. Workers from party training and scientific institutions of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the Polish United Workers Party, the Romanian Communist Party, the CPSU, and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia took part in the conference.

The speeches by those taking part in the conference touched on a broad range of topical issues of the methodology and theory of socialist ownership and forms of implementing, preserving, and augmenting it under the conditions of the revolutionary renewal of socialist society. Great attention was paid to an analysis of the structure and the correlation of the forms of state ownership and the mechanism of their interaction between themselves and with cooperative, family, and personal ownership.

There was a discussion of the question of the criteria of the socialist nature of forms of ownership and the differentiation of all-union, republican, and communal ownership and its primary and secondary forms. A number of speeches analyzed individual elements of the concept of the introduction of republican and regional economic accountability [khozraschet].

It was noted that the diversity of forms of ownership objectively gives rise to the intensification of the social differentiation of socialist society and the complication of its social structure. The result of this is the diversity of socioeconomic contradictions in socialist society, the range of their operation expands, and the mechanism for surmounting them is made many times more complex, which should be reflected more fully in the economic and social policy of the party and state.

Gerasimov Conducts 20 Sep News Briefing

Denies Arms Supplies to Nicaraugua

LD2009142389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1324 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 20 Sep, (TASS)—"The statement of Margaret Tutweiler, official U.S. State Department representative, alleging that the USSR is continuing and increasing the deliveries of arms to Nicaragua does not correspond to reality," Gennadiy Grasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate stated at a briefing here today. "Since 1988", he said, "the Soviet Union has not been delivering arms to Nicaragua and the U.S. side was officially informed of that at the beginning of this year. Later, that was stated publicly."

Many commentators, the Soviet diplomat added, evaluated this step by the USSR as a real contribution to the issue of a Central American settlement in the context of the peacemaking efforts undertaken by the countries of the region in order to end the conflict there. We have frequently come out in favor of the necessity of closer interaction with the United States in questions of a political settlement and we are continuing to keep to this line, Gennadiy Gerasimov pointed out.

Comments on Afghan Rebel Drug Trafficking

LD2009161289 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 20 TASS—There is new confirmation of the fact that Afghan "mujahidins" are heavily engaged in narcotics traffic, Gennadiy Gerasimov, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, told a briefing here today.

He said government troops in Nimruz Province had recently ambushed a unit of opposition forces which, fleeing from the battlefield, lost their dead, trucks and heavy armaments, and also 240 kilograms of narcotics and 70 million Afghani, apparently received for sold narcotics.

Gerasimov said that within the year which in accordance with the Afghan calendar ended on March 21, Afghan Government bodies captured from rebels 111,902 kilograms of hashish, 2,593 kilograms of opium and 702 kilograms of heroin.

He said that destinations of the caravans with narcotics produced in Afghanistan's and Pakistan's districts controlled by the opposition have long been known. They are Pakistan, Iran, Western Europe, Latin America and the United States.

In other words, definite circles in the West, above all in the United States, that give such a vigorous support to Afghan rebels, bear the responsibility for the continued bloodletting in Afghanistan and are also to blame for the spread of drug-addiction in their countries, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

Favors Hungarian Border Proposal

LD2009162789 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1400 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Jozsef Barath reports on one of the important aspects of Gerasimov's press briefing which took place today:

[Barath] Why should the Hungarian proposals to make the borders free of arms worry us? On the contrary, we consider them rather well-advised.

This is how foreign affairs spokesman Gerasimov replied this afternoon at his press briefing to a question from TIME magazine, as to whether this initiative would worry the Soviet Union and whether he sees in this an indication of the erosion and disintegration of the Warsaw Pact.

Welcomes Baker Statement on ICBM's

LD2009162889 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 20 TASS—The Soviet Union welcomes U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's statement that the United States may withdraw its proposal for a ban on mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM'S) at the U.S.-Soviet strategic arms reduction talks (START) and begin working on the sides' commitments to limit these missiles, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said today.

Gennadiy Gerasimov told reporters that Baker, however, made this stand conditional on congressional approval of allocations for two kinds of U.S. mobile systems, the MX and Midgetman.

The spokesman said that the issue of mobile ICBM's was an obstacle to a treaty on 50 per cent cuts in strategic offensive armaments.

"The Soviet stand on the issue is well known," he said "It proceeds from mutual agreement that mobile ballistic missiles help strengthen strategic stability since their mobility promotes their invulnerability, that is, preserves them for retaliation.

"Since the begining of the start talks, the Soviet Union has advocated the sides' right to deploy such missiles, and simultaneously proposed working out measures to limit and verify them.

"However, the U.S. side, although admitting that mobile ICBM's increase the missiles' survivability, called for their ban under the pretext that the missiles would be hard to verify."

Gerasimov said that the United States continues opposing a ban on sea-launched cruise missiles or measures to limit them under the same pretext.

He said that it "would not be bad if the secretary of state's words about his intention to propose an 'idea or

two' on start mean something new in respect of sea-launched cruise missiles, too.

"This would be logical and help work out a very important start treaty."

Expresses Concern on Namibia Situation

LD2009163189 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 20 TASS—The situation in Namibia six weeks before the general elections is causing continuous concern, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

The situation in the country, he went on to say, was discussed at the fifth, regular session of the joint observation commission for the settlement in south-west Africa that was held in Havana on September 13 through 15. The Soviet delegation took part in its work.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman said that a number of questions that are essential to ensure free and honest elections were left unanswered.

One such question concerned the fate of the Koevoet anti-guerilla force. Other provisions of the U.N. Security Council Resolution 640, adopted in late August, also await implementation.

The session's final memorandum, nevertheless, reiterated that the commission member-countries were prepared to continue their efforts to ensure the fulfillment of their obligations.

The soviet spokesman noted that the circumstances might necessitate an additional session of the commission before the Namibian elections.

This is why, he pointed out, the commission did not set the date for the next session, as it had done at all previous gatherings.

Notes Eagleburger Remarks on Reform

LD2009163589 Moscow TASS in English 1628 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 20 TASS—The Soviet Union paid great attention to the statement by U.S. Undersecretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger that the United States applauds the democratic reforms in the USSR and wishes them success, Soviet Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

Gerasimov quoted Eagleburger as telling the annual assembly of the national conference on Soviet Jewry that, as the changes continue in the Soviet Union, relations between the U.S. and the USSR may switch from competition to cooperation.

Eagleburger makes a favourable U.S. attitude to Moscow conditional on the changes in the USSR and their future development, Gerasimov said. Eagleburger thus propounds the thesis of American infallibility.

In the meantime, changes should be initiated by both sides. Many Western leaders, Gerasimov continued, believe that one cannot simply sit and look on, as Eagleburger suggests. Ways of promoting perestroyka in the USSR should be found, because this meets the interests of the West as well.

In this connection Gerasimov cited the statement by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on Tuesday in which he called to "find points of mutual advantage, gains that help them but that also, at the same time, serve our interests."

"This is a principled position. What is needed is the creative work of both sides," Gerasimov commented.

More on News Briefing

PM2009124589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Report from the USSR Foreign Ministry press center by correspondent G. Charodeyev: "Drawing the Requisite Conclusions for the Future"]

[Text] The latest briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists was addressed by G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration. It has already been reported in the press, he said, that on 17 September, in a number of Polish cities—Katowice, Krakow, Warsaw—rallies and demonstrations were organized outside the premises of the Soviet embassy, consulates, and other missions, in which extremist groupings participated. Some slogans and placards were abusive toward our country. They drew a parallel between fascist Germany's aggression against Poland and the USSR's actions on 17 September 1939. There were even demands for the "return of the eastern lands" and so forth. The extremists engaged in a number of actions which jeopardized the safety of the staff of Soviet establishments abroad. In this connection, the official conducting the briefing said the following:

Without entering into polemics in connection with the aforementioned absurd claims, I want to stress that our assessments of events on the eve of World War II have been set out in detail by officials and in the Soviet media. This is a complex question, which requires comprehensive, thorough consideration taking into account the international situation that existed at the time. As is known, a joint document on this period was prepared by a commission of Soviet and Polish scholars on the history of relations between the two countries. The work of the special committee set up by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies to elucidate all aspects of the political and legal assessment of the 1939 Soviet-German nonaggression pact continues. The purpose of all this research, as we see it, is not to reopen all the wounds of the past, but to draw the requisite conclusions for the future. For that reason, without forgetting about the tragedy of World War II, it is necessary to strengthen and augment everything that unites the peoples and brings them closer together. This is the imperative of the times.

The Soviet Union is aware that the extremist elements in Poland are not expressing the true feelings of the Polish people and their desire for good-neighborliness and cooperation with our people. We believe that the organizers of the provocations will not succeed in damaging the friendship and alliance between our countries and peoples. We are sure that the new Polish government is also conscious of the importance of strengthening comprehensive links and collaboration between the USSR and Poland....

The other day THE WASHINGTON TIMES published an article containing a detailed account of and comment on pronouncements in U.S. Congress by two eminent U.S. experts on arms issues—E. Warner, who works for the Rand Corporation, and P. Karber, vice president of BDM International. They claim that despite official statements by the Soviet side on the unilateral withdrawal and disbandment of units and armaments from the territories of its allies, what is in fact happening is that the combat equipment is being "transfused" into reorganized military formations. Neither E. Warner nor P. Karber is questioning the actual withdrawal of tanks, but they claim that artillery and other combat equipment is not returning to USSR territory.

Staff of the Information Administration asked their colleagues from the USSR Defense Ministry Press Center to help them obtain proper advice on this question. Here is the reply.

The data reflecting the progress in implementing the provisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree on the unilateral reduction of armed forces indicate that as of 15 September 24,509 men from the Groups of Forces had been withdrawn from the territory of our Warsaw Pact allies. This figure comprises 11,416 servicemen withdrawn from the territory of the GDR, 10,443 servicemen who were in Hungary as members of the Southern Group of Forces, and 1,150 and 1,500 men, respectively, from subunits of the Northern Group of Forces in Poland and Central Group of Forces in the CSSR.

During the same period 2,714 tanks were withdrawn, including 1,988 from the GDR, 87 from Poland, 192 from the CSSR, and 447 from Hungary. The figures for artillery are as follows: Out of a total of 383 artillery pieces withdrawn during the aforementioned period of time, 169 were withdrawn from, the GDR, 16 from Poland, 22 from the CSSR, and 176 from Hungary. As for aircraft, the overall number of aircraft on the territory of our allies has been reduced by 277, with 126 having been withdrawn from GDR territory, 55 from Polish territory, and 20 and 76, respectively, from the territories of the CSSR and Hungary. The aforementioned figures indicate that two tank divisions have been totally withdrawn from the Western Group of Forces, located on the territory of the GDR, and disbanded, and the same goes for one tank division that was in Hungary as part of the Southern Group of Forces. One aircraft regiment has been withdrawn from Poland and disbanded. Before the end of the year 500 tactical nulcear warheads will have been withdrawn from the territory of our Warsaw Pact allies.

As for the fate of the tanks that have been cut, some of them are being broken up for scrap and the rest are being converted into auxiliary equipment for the national economy (tow trucks, fire engines, and so on). The artillery systems withdrawn from service are being sent to arsenals and munition depots for storage and obsolete systems will be discarded. Aircraft that have been cut are also being written off and only a small number will be modified to serve as targets in the training of personnel.

Answering a question from a Reuter correspondent, G.I. Gerasimov stressed that the closure of the plant in Chapayevsk does not mean that we have stopped destroying chemical weapons. The current priority is the elaboration of a national program for the destruction of chemical weapons, which will take place in conditions of glasnost and democratization, taking into account the ecological aspect of the problem as well. It is necessary to learn the hard lessons from the history of the chemical weapons destruction plant in Chapayevsk, which was constructed without proper prior consultation with the local authorities and public. This resulted in a conflict situation concerning the plant. Several government commissions visited Chapayevsk, and, despite the fact that they deemed the chemical weapons destruction technology ecologically safe, it had to be decided not to open the plant and to redesignate it as a training center. In order to avoid any embarrassment, it will be necessary in the future, in particular, to carefully examine the chemical weapons destruction program at the relevant USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions.

USSR Ambassador to Syria A.I. Zotov spoke for the first time at a USSR Foreign Ministry press center briefing. He talked about the current state of relations between the Soviet Union and Syria.

TASS Rounds Up Briefing

LD2009172189 Moscow TASS in English 1659 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 20 TASS—The Soviet Union welcomes U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's statement that the United States may withdraw its proposal for a ban on mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) at the U.S.-Soviet Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) and begin working on the sides' commitments to limit these missiles, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said today.

"Since the beginning of the START talks," Gennadiy Gerasimov said, "The Soviet Union has advocated the sides' right to deploy such missiles, and simultaneously proposed working out measures to limit and verify them.

"However, the U.S. side, although admitting that mobile ICBM's increase the missiles' survivability, called for their ban under the pretext that the missiles would be hard to verify."

He said that it "would not be bad if the secretary of state's words about his intention to propose an 'idea or two' on start mean something new in respect of sea-launched cruise missiles, too.

"This would be logical and help work out a very important treaty on 50 per cent cuts in strategic offensive armaments."

There is new confirmation of the fact that Afghan "mujahidins" are heavily engaged in narcotics traffic, Gerasimov said.

He said that within the year which in accordance with the Afghan calendar ended on March 21, Afghan Government bodies captured from rebels 111,902 kilograms of hashish, 2,593 kilograms of opium and 702 kilograms of heroin.

Definite circles in the West, above all in the United States, that give such a vigorous support to Afghan rebels, bear the responsibility for the continued bloodletting in Afghanistan and are also to blame for the spread of drug-addiction in their countries, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

Gerasimov denied his U.S. counterpart Margaret Tutwiler's claims that the USSR is continuing or increasing arms shipments to Nicaragua.

"The Soviet Union has not supplied weapons to Nicaragua since 1988 and the American side was formally notified about this at the beginning of this year."

Many commentators praised the Soviet move as a real contribution to a Central American settlement in the context of peace-making efforts by the countries of the region, Gerasimov added.

Answering a question about the Soviet Union's reaction to the restoration of diplomatic relations between Hungary and Israel, Gerasimov said that "decisions on how to build one's relations with other countries belong to sovereign rights of countries and are determined by their national interests."

"The Soviet approach to restoration of relations with Israel is well known. We would be ready to tackle this issue when a real process of Middle East settlement begins, in the context of preparation and convocation of an international conference on the Middle East."

Petrovskiy Meets With Perez de Cuellar

LD2109064989 Moscow TASS in English 0636 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 21 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy met U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar here on Wednesday. During the meeting, the sides discussed the agenda of the 44th U.N. General Assembly session, the role of the international organisation under the present conditions, ways and means of raising the efficiency of U.N. operations, especially with respect to prevention of international crisis.

IAEA Opens Vienna Meeting on Nuclear Cooperation

LD2009195789 Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Vienna September 20 TASS—By TASS correspondent Viktor Tumanov:

Problems of organising international cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy and safe development of nuclear energetics will be discussed at a regular session of the board of governors of the international atomic energy agency, which opened here today. It is attended by representatives of 35 council member countries including the Soviet Union, as well as by observers from some international organisations.

The session participants will examine practical issues of the agency's activity related to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and strengthening of the IAEA safeguards system.

The question of Israel's nuclear potential has been included in the agenda.

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze in U.S. for Talks With Bush, Baker

Comments on Plenum, U.S. Trip

LD2009220389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1855 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Interview with USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by Correspondent Yuriy Rostov in Moscow on 20 September—recorded]

[Text] [Shevardnadze] [I have come] direct from the Central Committee plenum, and it would be no exaggeration to say that the Central Committee plenum has been discussing and is completing the discussions of what I would say is the most complex, the most sensitive question: the problem of improving interethnic relations in our country. This problem is complex not just in the conditions of our country; it is a complex, international problem, a major problem. I think Mikhail Sergeyevich's report, the debates, the Central Committee documents, and the platform, will undoubtedly provoke an immense response both in the country and abroad. I think we can boldly say that yet another major step has been taken along the path of the renewal of our society, in the renewal of our federation, and in filling our federation with new content. In the very near future this will be felt by all the peoples, all the republics, all the autonomous republics, by every person in every region of the Soviet Union. This is a great event, a great event.

I am sure that the plenum's decisions will also be welcomed by our friends abroad and our partners, because—as I understand it and I can state this boldly—there are no indifferent people on our planet when it comes to perestroyka and to the destiny of the democratization and the renewal of our society. Because the plenum is discussing, has discussed, such a fateful problem I believe this will be a major event, and not just from the viewpoint of our country's national interests.

Very important decisions on organizational matters were made at the plenum, and I have no doubt that these decisions will also be supported by our people and our party and our country. That is also very important.

[Rostov] The second [as heard] question, concerning the forthcoming visit: Some observers have written that one may expect some kind of breakthrough in the field, for example, of chemical weapons. What do you think? Are these hopes justified?

[Shevardnadze] You know, I would like to say that the Soviet leadership attaches great significance to the present Soviet-U.S. talks. If you judge from the statements and pronouncements by President Bush and Secretary of State Baker, it seems to me that the U.S. Administration is also approaching the preparation and the actual current round of Soviet-U.S. talks in a very responsible manner. I emphasize that our attitude is responsible. Soviet-U.S. relations are currently at what I would say a very crucial stage in which, as we understand it, the administration has completed what they describe as a "strategic review," and they are in a position to work toward real progress at the Soviet-U.S. talks.

Certain thoughts and ideas have been put forward by the President and in the secretary of state's speech yesterday. We understand the administration is ready for serious talks.

As far as our position is concerned, I am taking with me a very important note from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev for President Bush. It is a major political document. Generally, it sets out the views and positions of the Soviet Union and the Soviet leadership on the entire complex of disarmament, arms reduction and armed forces. This concerns reductions in nuclear arsenals, chemical weapons, nuclear explosions, and many other things, as well as conventional armaments. It also touches upon other problems in the military security field.

On this occasion, there will be an opportunity for a more detailed and thorough discussion of other aspects of bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, such as economic relations between our countries, exchanges between people, human rights questions, and transnational problems. This year the talks [changes thought] ...there will be a meeting with the President in Washington tomorrow. After that meeting with the President, there will be talks in Wyoming. I accept and have accepted this invitation with gratitude since, as we have been told, all conditions have been created there for all the complex problems which currently face our countries to be discussed in a peaceful, good, and businesslike atmosphere.

We have certain specific ideas on nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, conventional weapons and the whole complex. I think they will evoke interest on the part of the administration and the U.S. leadership.

[Prostov] Thank you very much.

Makes Departure Statement

LD2009182489 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow September 20 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today left Moscow for the United States. During talks with U.S. President George Bush and Secretary of State James Baker he will discuss a wide range of issues of Soviet-U.S. relations and world affairs.

Shevardnadze will also take part in the 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly in New York.

Before the departure, Shevardnadze made the following statement:

"We are leaving for the United States on an important mission, in anticipation of serious talks on a wide range of issues of Soviet-U.S. relations.

During meeting with President George Bush, we expect to have serious and substantial conversation, whose importance is underlined by a highly responsible period in our relations with the U.S. the current moment is crucial to a large extent from the point of view of prospects for developing Soviet-U.S. relations, both in the next few years, and in the long term. I think that it is clear to everybody.

We are carrying Mikhail Gorbachev's message to President Bush. This is an profound and constructive document. It is devoted to the key issue—disarmament. We proceed from the fact that from the very beginning Gorbachev's message will give the necessary impulse to the forthcoming talks in Washington and in Wyoming, where we will have two days of talks with Secretary of State Baker.

I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to express gratitude for the invitation to visit this beautiful region. We do not travel light to Wyoming, but with a solid baggage of ideas and proposals aimed at attaining concrete results in the main areas of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue.

We hope that our expectations will be justified and the results of the forthcoming meetings will materialise into weighty practical agreements which will be on a par with the big tasks facing our countries."

Brings 'Interesting Proposals'

LD2109034689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0232 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Washington, 21 Sep [TASS]—Eduard Shevardnadze, Member of the CPSU Central Committee's Politbureau, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, arrived Wednesday evening on a visit to the U.S. capital. At Andrews Air Force base near Washington he was met by First Deputy U.S. Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleberger; Jack Matlock, U.S. Ambassador in the USSR; and by other U.S. officials. Among those who met him were Yu. V. Dubinin, USSR ambassador in the United States, and high-ranking personnel of the Soviet Embassy and of other Soviet establishments in Washington.

During a conversation with journalists by the steps of the aircraft, the USSR foreign minister noted: "There are many proposals in the portfolio we have brought. Interesting proposals." One of the journalists asked: Are there surprises among the proposals you brought with you? "I would not call them surprises," replied E.A. Shevardnadze. "But they are interesting."

"We have arrived in Washington at an important period in Soviet- U.S. relations," he noted. "At a period when changes are occurring in Soviet society, when much is changing in relations between East and West." Asked a question about the message from the Soviet leadership that the foreign minister will convey to the U.S. President when they meet, Eduard Shevardnadze said that it contains important ideas in the sphere of arms control and proposals targetted at reducing military confrontation. He stressed that these proposals should promote the elimination of most of the impediments at the talks in Geneva, at the talks on conventional weapons and on chemical weapons, and on other problems. Asked about the rates of development of Soviet-U.S. relations, the minister said: "We must say that the rates of their development must be accelerated." On Thursday the USSR foreign minister will meet U.S. President George Bush at the White House. On 22 and 23 September Eduard Shevardnadze will hold talks in the state of Wyoming with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. During the talks with the U.S. President and secretary of state, he will discuss a broad range of questions relating to Soviet-U.S. relations and world politics.

According to the evaluations of political observers here, the necessary prerequisites now have been created to take the Soviet-U.S. dialogue toward a new horizon. The task of the heads of the foreign policy departments of the two countries in this connection is to clear the road for a new meeting of the highest leaders of the USSR and the United States.

Eduard Shevardnadze also will take part in the work of the 44th session of the UN General Assembly in New York.

U.S. Expected To Seek More Soviet 'Concessions'

PM2009121789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Gan: "Prior to Wyoming Meeting"]

[Text] Washington—There is an abundance of conjecture, supposition, and plain speculation surrounding the new round of Soviet-American contacts at foreign minister level to be held at Jackson Hole, Wyoming, at the end of the week. But what manifestly is lacking are any more or less reliable ideas on what the American side intends to bring to the meeting.

I would not be lying if I said that the White House is playing its cards very close to its chest and is saying nothing for the time being in order to stun the world with some sensations. Reports about "U.S. determination to enter a new and more serious phase of talks" and about the "end of initial contacts with Moscow and a switch to serious work" constantly issue from the house on Pennsylvania Avenue. Last Thursday, under instruction rather than out of his well-known talkativeness, White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater told correspondents that the Soviet minister will be assured of "support for the reforms in the Soviet Union" and that endeavors will be made to dispel any "misunderstandings regarding our intention to make progress in arms control with as much speed as we can." "And what's more," he added, "we

reject any suggestion of American procrastination in the SALT talks or that the talks have been put on the back burner."

One can scarcely imagine such declarations were made out of good will. It should be perfectly clear to everyone following the progress of Soviet-American talks that they are rather a "defensive reaction" to the reproaches of dilatoriness, indecision, and an "unduly cautious approach" in this sphere made to the White House.

That today's Bush administration is far from burning with enthusiasm regarding the conclusion of agreements with the USSR is acknowledged as an incontrovertible fact even here. Only the explanations differ, depending on whom you speak to. People close to the administration either hint or state directly that no agreement exists to date in Washington's upper echelons on whether perestroyka "will survive or not" in the Soviet Union, whether it is worth helping perestroyka by accords, or whether this is consonant with America's long-term interests. The "subtext" here is as follows: Only Moscow, with its pressing problems, needs to hurry and make compromises, while Washington can bide its time, particularly as "political pressure" in favor of a SALT treaty is, it is thought on the Potomac, declining, since the overwhelming majority of the public does not believe in a "Soviet threat."

Some observers conclude from such authoritative statements that the White House is not prepared for any initiatives to activate talks with the USSR. THE WASHINGTON POST, in particular, reports that American officials in preparing for the talks with E.A. Shevardnadze paid little attention to elaborating "potential solutions" to the basic problems blocking agreement on limiting strategic and offensive armaments. As a result, according to the newspaper, Soviet-American disagreements in this regard can scarcely be "quickly settled unless new Soviet proposals contain substantial concessions." In other words, this clearly shows again an intention to play the unfitting "one-sided game" which Washington has already repeatedly essayed without success.

Incidentally, there is also a purely domestic consideration here which shaped up in the summer, when the Senate and House of Representatives got embroiled in trenchant debate with the administration and among themselves on the question of Pentagon appropriations. Insisting on keeping all the main programs for the latest armaments intact, the White House essentially blackmailed Congress with threats to "revise" its approach to arms control talks or even abandon them. Now, however, with deadlock over the military budget still persisting, the administration is "pushing" the thesis that it "cannot" definitively formulate its strategic priorities and stance on a future treaty because of the legislators' stance.

TASS Cites Baker on Upcoming Wyoming Meeting

LD2009141789 Moscow TASS in English 1413 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 20 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker made a statement on the upcoming meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in Wyoming on September 22-23 on Tuesday, amid mounting criticism of President Bush's indecisiveness on arms control.

Baker tried to fend off mounting criticism of the Bush administration's "wait and see" policy on arms control, the reduction of strategic offensive arsenals and limits on underground nuclear tests.

The United States expects the Soviet Union to "respond positively to our conventional forces initiative," Baker said, without mentioning the latest Soviet initiatives in this sphere and several constructive unilateral Soviet steps.

At the same time Baker said that the United States will lift its ban on mobile ICBM's at the START talks, abandoning its previous demand to ban the deployment of mobile intercontinental missiles.

The previous U.S. position on the issue was motivated by the fact that intercontinental ballistic missiles play a decisive role in the Soviet nuclear arsenal, while the U.S. nuclear triad mostly relies on sea-based and air-launched nuclear forces.

"We will be instructing our START negotiators in Geneva to work out the appropriate details of limits to be applied to mobile ICBM's and effective verification measures," Baker said at the meeting.

"In the area of chemical weapons, we have, I think, a reasonable shot at an agreement to exchange data on chemical stocks which, I think, is a first practical step toward achieving real controls and eventualy a total ban."

The U.S. "will be offering proposals designed to break the 15-year nuclear testing log jam," he said.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly offered the United States to negotiate a complete ban on underground nuclear tests.

The discussions will be taking place against a backdrop of significant major changes in the Soviet Union, Baker stressed, saying that the United States recognises the pressure "which the Soviets face" and that "there are no simple or quick fixes to these and no one from the outside can solve these problems for them."

"So the question is: What can and what should we do?. The answer, I think, to that is that we should find points of mutual advantage, gains that help them but that also, at the same time, serve our interests. This approach

requires, of course, some creativity on the part of both of us. I think that this ministerial will reflect that strategy," Baker said.

First Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger, speaking in Washington on Tuesday, said that great changes in the U.S. Government's exchanges with the Soviet leadership are mostly the result of unprecedented and exciting changes inside the Soviet Union.

China

'Tree of Friendship' With PRC Deeply Rooted

OW2109031389 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] The Supreme Soviet delegation headed by Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has ended a visit to China. Station reporter (Kulikov) reports from Beijing:

During its 1-week visit, the delegation was busy meeting with state leaders, workers, farmers, intellectuals, and youths. One important conclusion that can be drawn from the visit is that contacts between the peoples of the two socialist countries have been resumed and expanded. The ties were given a new lease on life with Gorbachev's visit to China. The two elected and representative organs of the Soviet Union and China have conducted another important and constructive dialogue.

We can learn a lot from Chinese counterparts. We want to see how China is carrying out reforms. We also want to introduce to Chinese counterparts our reform experience. Lukyanov made these remarks when he arrived in China.

Among the topics discussed at meetings between Soviet people's representatives and their Chinese counterparts were: how to solve problems concerning environmental protection and public health, and how to overcome problems in developing a market economy. Both countries are confronted with the serious problem of inflation which impedes social development.

The delegation was composed of people from all walks of life. When I asked them if they were satisfied with the results of their visit to China, their response was the same; that is, the visit was beneficial. They said the visit would benefit their future work, particularly the work of people's representatives.

Of all the members of the delegation, I was most impressed with the remarks of Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, with whom I talked before his departure for home. He said that in meeting with ordinary Chinese, whether hoary old folks or the new generation of Chinese youths, they all attached importance to the friendly sentiments of the 1950s, the years of cooperation; they showed great warmth toward us and expressed hopes for further and fuller development of relations between the two countries. Lukyanov said the tree of friendship between the Soviet Union and China is deeply rooted.

PRC Anti-Bourgeois Measures Continue, Detailed

PM1909115789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Savenkov dispatch: "September Days in Beijing"]

[Text] Beijing—The "futian"—as people in Beijing call the period of oppressive humid heat—is over. At the same time, the multicolored umbrellas protecting from the sun's rays the helmeted soldiers armed with assault rifles have disappeared from the bridges, crossroads, and road junctions. But the soldiers themselves still remain on guard. The martial law introduced in the city on May 20 remains in force. It is estimated that there are about 100,000 servicemen enforcing martial law in Beijing and its suburbs.

Outwardly, Beijing has hardly changed since last September. It is just that you do not see the tourists who introduced an element of variety in the crowds and filled Tiananmen Square. The square is deserted now. It is still guarded by soldiers but, true enough, their numbers have been sharply reduced compared with the tumultuous days in June. The square remains closed to visitors, but preparations are already under way for the 1 October celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the PRC's proclamation.

Is martial law likely to last much longer? Replying to this question some time ago, PRC Council of State Spokesman Yuan Mu assessed the situation as follows: The struggle is not yet over. The weapons pilfered from soldiers have not yet been surrendered. Martial law will remain in force until such time as public order is fully restored. Yuan Mu also called on government [singular as published], organizations, and foreign citizens, on those who wish to maintain friendship and business ties with China, to abandon demands for the lifting of martial law as a precondition.

Studies in most of Beijing's higher education establishments resumed earlier than usual. The main reason is the course of ideological and political education which every student must attend. The course's objective is to explain to students the sources and causes of events which began last April. It is based on an analysis of past events as provided by Deng Xiaoping and the latest party documents. Every student must take a close look at what he said and did in those stormy days of spring, and must make an assessment of his actions. Every higher education establishment has issued new internal order regulations. They demand strict observance of circulars issued by the municipal government and by the command of troops enforcing martial law, and ban statements and activities which run contrary to "the four basic principles" (socialist path, leadership by the Communist Party,

democratic dictatorship by the people, and Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong's thoughts). Public lectures and the functioning of political clubs without official permission are banned. There are also other bans. For example, it is forbidden to post "large-character wall posters" or to publish bulletins "pursuing reactionary goals," to engage in illegal business, or to gamble. Study programs are structured in the spirit of the demand that people "must be ideologically Red and professionally knowledgeable."

The mass media allocate considerable space to the topic of students. RENMIN RIBAO for example, insisting that the democratization process should be gradual and lengthy, calls on young people to adopt a self-critical attitude toward their actions and to "delete themselves from the category of special citizens." Political studies, whose main objective is to interpret and appraise last spring's events in Beijing including the June drama, are held not only in higher education establishments. They form part of the working day at institutions and enterprises.

Numerous seminars, forums, and conferences are being held at the same time, discussing the need to step up ideological work, consolidate the party ranks, and struggle against "bourgeois liberalization." In every instance, blame for slackening the emphasis on these points is laid on former General Secretary Zhao Ziyang, who was relieved of all leadership positions in the party at the CPC Central Committee June Plenum. For example, a forum devoted to the struggle against the spread of "bourgeois liberalization" in literature and art criticized Zhao Ziyang's benevolent attitude toward the controversial television movie "The River's Sorrow," which was shown last year.

The makers of this movie renounced the stereotyped journey from the source of Huanghe River to its mouth and were not carried away by enthusiastic descriptions. They took a fresh look at China's symbols—the Huanghe River as the cradle of the Chinese nation, the Great Wall of China, the "dragon phenomenon." China has given the world much talent and many values, the makers reflected. But a leaning toward exclusiveness and conservatism is one of the Chinese culture's specific features. In the makers' opinion, the Chinese nation's character has some weak points—fatalism and nonresistance to violence. And this encourages backwardness. Talent can be developed only by learning from others. Remnants of the ancient feudal culture, like the Huanghe River's silt, clog up the nation's blood vessels. The floodwaters of the thaw must purify them—this is the movie makers' conclusion.

Attitudes toward this movie differed. Some people perceived in it a call to deepen the policy of reforms and open door to the world, others saw it as reviling Chinese culture and mocking the national character. Critics at the forum in question were unanimous. They ranked the movie among works which are disrespectful toward China's traditional culture and accused Zhao Ziyang of always shutting his eyes to this phenomenon. It is said that he offered a copy of the movie to foreign visitors and ardently advised them to watch it.

There can be no doubt that the regular sitting of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress was one of the signs of September. It was calm, or at least the press did not hear of any passions flaring. The draft law on rallies and demonstrations was again not adopted. It was decided to continue discussing it. The same fate befell the draft law on the organization of urban citizens' committees. It was also decided to extend until the end of October the gathering of opinions on the draft fundamental law of the special administrative region of Xianggang (Hong Kong), which should regulate its relations with Beijing following Hong Kong's decolonialization in 1997 and the restoration of China's sovereign rights over this territory.

The famous writer Wang Meng was relieved of his duties as minister of culture, a post he held since June 1986. XINHUA reported that this was done at his request. He had repeatedly expressed the desire to dedicate himself to prose writing and criticism. Observers note that while Wang Meng held the office of minister of culture, the world witnessed an upsurge of Chinese cinematography which won numerous prizes at international competitions. Interesting and poignant works appeared in theater and literature. In his creative work, Wang Meng strives to depict the problems of social life in an unusual light. His literary emergence in the early fifties was impressive. The new writer was immediately noticed. But in 1957 he was labeled as "right-wing element," was expelled from the party, and was sent for "labor reeducation." The critic of bureaucratic distortions within the party proved unsuitable at that time. There followed a brief rehabilitation, and then a fresh period of physical labor and literary oblivion during the difficult years of the "cultural revolution" (1966-1976). Final rehabilitation came only in 1979, and it brought a period of active literary and social work. The writer, whose creed is "movement from necessity to freedom," is well known to Soviet readers—an anthology of his works was recently published by the "Raduga" Publishing House.

The writer's release from the office of minister was another notable event of this year's fall in Beijing.

Northeast Asia

Japan-Soviet Deputy Ministerial Meeting Held

OW1909234289 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 15 Sep 89

[Text] Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev and Councillor Owada of the Japanese Foreign Ministry held a working-level meeting in Moscow on 13 September. The meeting was held in connection with the foreign ministerial meeting between the two countries scheduled for the end of this month in New York during the UN

General Assembly. Foreign Minister Shevardnadze also met Councillor Owada on the same day.

According to information provided by the Soviet Foreign Ministry to Radio Moscow reporters Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and Councillor Owada agreed to hold the foreign ministerial meeting on 27 September. During the meeting, Councillor Owada said that the Japanese Government attaches importance to relations with the USSR and will continue efforts to promote balanced development of relations in various areas. Foreign Minister Shevardnadze stressed the fact that there is a considerable upsurge in various areas of Soviet-Japanese exchanges at present. In order to open a new chapter in relations with Japan, he confirmed the Soviet stance as being consistent with the agreements reached concerning the further improvement of Soviet-Japanese relations.

During the working level meeting between Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev and Councillor Owada, the two held an in-depth exchange of views on various issues in Soviet-Japanese relations in preparation for the foreign ministerial meeting in New York. They discussed certain urgent international issues of interest to both countries.

Both sides highly appraised Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's visit to Tokyo last December, which initiated changes leading to improvements in bilateral relations. These changes include the marked vitalization of political dialogue, cooperation in trade, economics, science and technology, and active cultural exchanges.

During the meeting, both sides agreed that more efforts are necessary in order to further develop Soviet-Japanese relations. Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev and Councillor Owada paid great attention to the question of signing a peace treaty between the two countries, which is one of the major topics in the Soviet-Japanese dialogue at the present stage.

Both sides positively appraised the discussions held at the permanent working group meeting on the peace treaty and proposed to continue such discussions. They stressed that the resolution of the peace treaty issue, and particularly the way to an agreement on the Soviet-Japanese boundary issue which is to be settled by the treaty should not run counter to the political reality which is reflected in various international legal documents and has become the solid basis of the present world structure, but lies in consistent respect and further consolidation of this reality.

In the discussions on international issues, emphasis was placed mainly on the Cambodian situation, the situation on the Korean peninsula, and other issues. On the issues discussed, both sides expressed quite a number of views which were either very similar or identical. For instance, both the USSR and Japan advocated the achievement of a comprehensive political settlement of the Cambodian problem and the improvement of the political environment on the Korean peninsula.

Both the Soviet deputy foreign minister and the Japanese foreign affairs councillor appraised the Moscow meeting as a constructive discussion which was beneficial and substantial in content. The meeting is believed to have laid a solid groundwork for the success of the Soviet-Japanese foreign ministerial meeting in New York.

South Korean Leader's 'Community' Plan Cited

PM1509110589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "No Tae-u Proposal"]

[Text] Tokyo, 11 Sep—South Korean President No Tae-u today proposed at a session of the National Assembly (parliament) a concept of forming a "Korean community" as an interim step toward reuniting the North and South in a "United Democratic Republic."

Calling for the earliest possible bilateral summit meeting, No Tae-u proposed convening a council of the two heads of state which should, in his opinion, become the community's supreme leading organ. It is proposed at the same time to create a Council of Ministers with the participation of the prime ministers of South Korea and the DPRK plus 10 ministers from each side, which will be concerned with solving the problem of reuniting the 10 million members of divided families in the North and South, reducing political confrontation, and halting the pointless enmity.

Belousov Meets, Sees Off DPRK Premier 8 Sep

PM1409102189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Sep 89 Second Edition p4

[TASS report: "On the Way Home"]

[Text] On 8 September a DPRK delegation led by Yon Hyong-muk, member of the Workers Party of Korea (WPK) Central Committee Politburo and premier of the DPRK Administration Council, made a brief stopover in Moscow on the way home, after taking part in the Ninth Conference of the Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries in Belgrade. The delegation included Kim Yong-nam, member of the WPK Central Committee Politburo, vice premier of the Administration Council, and DPRK foreign minister.

The delegation was met and seen off at the airport by I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister; and other officials.

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Government Responds to Bhutto Statements

LD2009213289 Moscow TASS In English 2112 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Kabul September 21 TASS—The BAKHTAR news agency circulated on Wednesday [20 September] a

statement by the Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Afghanistan in connection with recent interview by Pakistan's Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto about internal and external aspects of the Afghan problem.

The statement says that Benazir Bhutto's pronouncements that the present Afghan Government should be deposed and replaced by the so-called mujahiden transitional government and her promises to continue aid to the Peshawar leaders show that Islamabad continues to follow in the wake of Washington's policy aimed at the escalation of war and fratricide in Afghanistan.

The Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Afghanistan deplores that fact that at a time when the Afghan Government made new proposals for a political settlement to the Afghan problem, statements by the Pakistani prime-minister only lead to further aggravation of the situation in the country and the whole region.

It is only Afghans who have the right to decide the political destiny of their country, the document says. Every condition for ensuring national concord and a constructive political dialogue between the sides have now been created in Afghanistan. Interference by Pakistan and the United States will not do good any of the sides.

Reporters Back Afghan Rebuttal of BBC, VOA

PM1909150989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA, TASS special correspondents Yu. Vladimirov and A. Greshnov dispatch under the rubric "On-the-Spot Report": "The Answer Was Obtained in Shindand, or 'Canards' in the Air..."]

[Excerpts] Kabul, Shindand, Kabul— We, the undersigned, have only just returned from Shindand, a small city located only a few dozen kilometers from the border with Iran. The following circumstance made us embark on the long journey from Kabul.

A few days ago the "Voice of America" and the BBC, broadcasting in Dari, reported with reference to "independent sources" the capture of Shindand by armed detachments of the "irreconcilables." N. Amani, the spokesman of the Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Afghanistan, rebutted the radio stations' reports at a briefing, decribing them as fabrications. Since the so-called "independent sources" frequently shout about their victories even before an attack has been launched, Western journalists were nodding agreement: Yes, they would report the official statement of the Afghan leadership to their editorial offices. But what is really happening in Shindand? The answer, it seemed, could only be found on the spot. [passage omitted]

Life in the city was taking its normal course. The market stalls were trading.

The city hall windows had been shattered by rocket fire. Is this perhaps evidence of an armed attack?

"No," we were told. "There was an armed incident recently, it is true—not in Shindand, though, but in Charmakhal [name as transliterated], a small village in the immediate vicinity of the city." [passage omitted]

Could it be that the radio voices, eager to please those people in the United States and Pakistan who insist on the continuation of the military conflict in Afghanistan and the overthrow of the "Kabul regime," deliberately hastened to present the echo of an armed clash in Charmakhal village as the fall of Shindand? If this is true, it is to be regretted that this kind of "canard" was launched on the eve of an international seminar about to open in Kabul about the place and role of the mass media in the coverage of regional conflicts.

Afghan Rebel's Situation, Setbacks Described

PM1909110189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[Dispatch by PRAVDA special correspondent Yu. Vladimirov and TASS correspondent Yu. Tyssovskiy: "'Fighting Season'"]

[Text] Kabul, September—The fall is approaching Afghanistan slowly, as it were, reluctantly. In the mountains it is having almost no effect. But among the green plane trees the yellow strand of a wilting poplar can suddenly be seen here and there. The days have become noticeably shorter and the evenings cooler. The city bazaars are collapsing under the weight of vegetables and fruit.

The war is continuing to rage in the "land of the mountains." Every day it takes tens or even hundreds of lives. But it is not long until November. Why November precisely? Because by the end of this month snow will begin to fall thickly and cover the secret mountain paths and until April will make it extremely difficult for the armed opposition to conduct active hostilities.

Some 2-3 months ago Washington strategists introduced with regard to Afghanistan the term "fighting season," having in mind that in the period from June through November they give the "intransigents" a chance of showing the world at least some successes with the aid of massive deliveries of new weapons.

But the further time advances the more evident is the obvious inability of the Afghan opposition entrenched in Peshawar to achieve military successes. And that despite the enormous financial and military aid from the United States and Saudi Arabia and the involvement of the Pakistani military in the combat operations.

For 124 days thugs from the most diverse "parties" and groupings of "intransigents" have been advancing in waves on the administrative center of Nangarhar Province, Jalalabad, in order to capture it and billet there the

so-called "transitional government" cobbled together by the Pakistani special forces in Rawalpindi. But the rebels have not only had to lift the siege from the Nangarhar stronghold but have also been forced back to the border with Pakistan.

Having broken their teeth on the Jalalabad nut the opposition ringleaders have recently decided to compensate for their moral and psychological loss by capturing the small town of Khowst—a regional center just 40 km from the Pakistani border. About 7,000 mujahidin, Pakistani militiamen, and numerous Arab and other "advisers" are now concentrated there. Fierce fighting has been continuing now for several weeks in the region of Khowst, but its defenders are resolutely rebuffing the enemy's superior forces.

The opposition forces' attempts to activate hostilities in Qandahar, Herat, and other key provinces of Afghanistan remain totally futile.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST, U.S. diplomat Edmund McWilliams cannot be suspected of sympathizing with the "Kabul regime." Last summer McWilliams worked as an adviser at the U.S. Embassy in Kabul. Approximately a year ago he was sent to Islamabad as a special representative attached to the Afghan rebels based in Pakistan and there are therefore grounds for supposing that McWilliams has understood the complexities and features of the contradictory Afghan problem.

Thus, at the height of the fighting near Jalalabad, in telegrams to the U.S. State Department the U.S. diplomat wrote that "U.S. hopes for the rebels' rapid military victory over the Kabul regime are unrealistic." The strategists on the Potomac, he explained, are taking too little consideration of the complex tribal, ethnic, and religious features which have always distinguished Afghanistan and, in placing its main emphasis on a military solution, Washington is surrendering the political initiative to the Najibullah regime. But this sober view was not to the taste of the hotheads from the U.S. foreign policy department. McWilliams was recalled to Washington.

Yet the siccing of the "intransigents" is continuing. In particular persistent demands are being heard for a direct attack on the capital to be initiated. The mujahidin are in no hurry to follow such advice, fearing, it is to be supposed, that defeat awaits them beneath the city walls. But dollars have to be earned and for that reason the rebels are resorting to inhumane actions like the daily firing on Kabul's residential areas with sophisticated U.S. rockets, including cluster rockets intended to kill as many people as possible.

"Kabul's inhabitants are extremely emotional in expressing their anger over the rocket firing, which often encompasses residential regions and markets, killing civilians," THE WASHINGTON POST correspondent James Rupert wrote recently. "They denounce the United States for its continuing arms aid to the guerrillas while the USSR has suggested to the United States that they jointly end such outside shipments."

As a whole, we were told at the Afghan Foreign Ministry press center, in the 6 months since the Soviet troops' withdrawal the "intransigents" have lost 32,600 men, 200 foreign "advisers," and 50 field commanders killed in the fighting. Nearly 19,000 people have been wounded. Those are the results of the Peshawar gang leaders' adventurism.

The fierce squabbling for power is not abating in the camp of the "diehard" opposition. Nor has this fate been avoided by the "alliance of seven," whose latent reprisals merged this July into a large-scale armed conflict which has been called "the northern war."

The war assumed the overt and merciless form of a struggle not only for so-called "zones of influence" but also for dominance in the opposition camp. The "Islamic Party of Afghanistan" headed by G. Hikmatyar was viewed by the mujahidin's U.S. patrons as the most powerful and "effective" in the military respect. For that reason the lion's share of the dollars and weapons have traditionally been placed at the disposal of this "leader." Hikmatyar's main rival in the "seven" is B. Rabbani, ringleader of the "Islamic Society of Afghanistan."

Nonetheless Washington and Islamabad are continuing to gamble on overthrowing "the communist regime in Kabul" by military means. That is in fact on the continuation of the bloodshed and "war to the last Afghan."

Against this background the policy of national conciliation proclaimed by the Afghan Government is winning ever more supporters. President Najibullah's proposals come down to establishing a truce and creating on a broad basis a transitional coalition government which would ensure the holding of free elections in Afghanistan.

Pesjawar rejects these flexible and far-reaching proposals. But it is not the "intransigents" alone who determine the face of the opposition today. Many field commanders have responded to the president's appeal to renounce hostilities on condition that they retain control over the relevant zones and provide the population with everything necessary.

Najibullah Speech, Afghan Situation Reported

LD2009121289 Moscow TASS in English 1038 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Kabul September 20 TASS—More than 300 extremists were killed and some 400 wounded in Nangarhar Province, Khowst district and other areas of Afghanistan in the course of last week's fighting. The Afghan Armed Forces lost seven men killed and 18 wounded during the same period, the BAKHTAR news service reports. Five civilians were killed and 11 wounded by missiles. Approximately 700 former rebels

have gone over to the government's side during the past week. More than 400 refugees have returned home from Pakistan.

Addressing a meeting of commanders of territorial detachments (made up of former rebels, who had gone over to the government's side) and tribal units, President Najibullah stressed their growing importance in the overall structure of national Armed Forces. Najibullah said that the task of territorial troops and tribal units was not only to defend the areas where they lived, but to wage an armed struggle against bandits all over the country.

F. Armakora, special spokesman of the U.N. Human Rights Commission on Afghanistan, is now staying in the country. He had meetings with representatives of several state bodies, including the Ministries of Defence and State Security.

Hostility is mounting rapidly among different rebel organisations. According to well-informed sources, Gulbuddin Hikmatyar's "Islamic Party" is becoming increasingly isolated militarily and politically. Five of the seven parties making up the Peshawar "alliance" now come out against it. Rebel opposition to the Afghan Government is receding into the background in the light of all this and put to the forefront now is intestine struggle for "zones of influence" within Afghanistan. According to certain information, Hikmatyar has ordered the ringleaders of his underground in Afghan towns to report to state security organs the names of "fifth column" members subordinated to the "Islamic Society of Afghanistan". It is believed in Afghan competent organs that the success of the latest operations to wipe out the society's underground in Kabul was partially due to this. Arrested in the course of these actions were four terrorists headed by a certain Salem, who planned a series of subversive acts in the capital, and also a group led by Khalil, which exploded a bomb at "Bamian" cinemahouse in Kabul this July.

Andreyev Comments on Syrian-Iranian Relations

NC2009115289 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] A Syrian Government delegation headed by Syrian Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar' arrived in Tehran yesterday, focusing political circles' attention on current Iranian-Syrian relations. Our commentator, Yuriy Andreyev writes:

The main objective behind the Syrian foreign minister's visit to Iran is to prepare for the upcoming visit by Hafiz al-Asad to Tehran. Even though the exact date of this visit has not been set, reports indicate that it is to be soon.

Iranian officials say that the talks with Hafiz al-Asad will be unprecedented and will raise Iranian-Syrian relations to a new level.

The close cooperation between Damascus and Tehran is not new. Iran and Syria have coordinated their activities on the international scene for years. However, it seems that Iranian-Syrian relations will acquire a new quality.

The issue today is one of further closeness between Tehran and Baghdad [as heard] which will apparently have more impact on the situation in the Near and Middle East.

Clearly, this closeness cannot be accidental. The closeness between Iran and Syria stems from a range of significant issues in foreign policy. Both countries have joint strategic interests in the region. First, Israel is their major enemy in the Near East. In 1982, after Tel Aviv's decision to annex the Golan Heights, Iran announced its readiness to send its troops to Syria to help. Following this, the anti-Israeli alliance between Damascus and Tehran strengthened further. Both countries agreed on joint operations against Tel Aviv in Lebanon and about the coordination of their steps within the framework of the Islamic Conference. Moreover, we should recall that during the Iran-Iraq war, Syria supported Iran. We know that an air link to transport goods and war materiel had been set up between the two countries. Syria, with years of differences with Iraq, was Tehran's major partner from among the Arab countries during the armed confrontation between Tehran and Baghdad. This situation is expected to continue.

Our commentator adds: The enemy [as heard] is extremely interested in the further consolidation of cooperation with Tehran. The Islamic Republic of Iran is the major oil exporter to Syria. During recent years, Iran has unconditionally delivered 1 million tonnes of oil annually to Syria at a time when Syria's debts to Iran within the framework of oil agreements has surpassed the $2-billion mark.

Thus, the closeness of political and economic interests between Damascus and Tehran forms a strong basis for the expansion of bilateral relations. It is not accidental that this is the major topic of discussion in the talks between Syrian Foreign Minister Faruq al-Sahr' and the Iranian leadership.

Our commentator adds: The fact that the visit by the high-ranking Syrian delegation to Tehran comes immediately after the relatively strong remarks by Iranian President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani against Iran is interesting. We recall that the president threatened that if Baghdad does not withdraw its troops from the occupied Iranian territories, Iran will resort to force.

The current Iranian-Syrian talks and the upcoming visit by Hafiz al-Asad to Tehran may be aimed at inflicting certain pressures on Iraq. The Islamic Republic of Iran

has shown that it continues to have reliable supporters among the Arab countries which carry weight against Iraqi influence.

Envoy to Damascus Discusses Soviet-Syrian Ties

LD1809164689 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT 18 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 18 TASS—The Soviet Union has multi-faceted and advanced relations with Syria along many directions, Soviet ambassador to Syria Aleksandr Zotov told a press conference here today. He was speaking within the frame of a briefing at the Soviet Foreign Ministry press centre.

Syria, Zotov continued, is by right one of the key countries of the Middle East. It occupies a special place in the system of Soviet-Arab relations.

The world political attention is now drawn to Syria in many respects, as that country is a major component of the Middle East situation and a link in the regional conflict.

Syria draws international attention to itself also because it neighbours on Lebanon and although it is not a party to the Lebanese internal conflict, it is nevertheless a component of the present situation in Lebanon, which is viewed as tragic in the Soviet Union.

The development of relations between the Soviet Union and Syria is pivotal in the light of the processes underway in the Soviet Union, the present Middle East situation and the internal situation in Syria, especially in the economic field, which is particularly complicated this year, the ambassador said.

Perestroika in the Soviet Union, Zotov noted, evokes close attention in Syria. The dominant question for Syrians is how these processes in the Soviet Union can affect the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation that link the Soviet Union and Syria.

More specifically, the question is asked in this connection, whether the high level of trust, confidence and political coordination in the relations between the two countries will be shattered as a result of the great attention that the Soviet Union now attaches to its internal concerns.

Won't economic reforms in the Soviet Union affect the Soviet readiness to render assistance in many fields to the development of the Syrian economy? the Syrians wonder.

What effect will the reduction of Soviet Armed forces and the conversion of the defence industry to peaceful production have on the preparedness of the Soviet Union to help Syria ensure its defence potential, they ask.

These factors, naturally, leave their imprint on the nature and peculiarities of relations between the two countries, but by no means imply their weakening, the Soviet diplomat stressed.

Zotov called political coordination a paramount factor determining the nature of relations between the Soviet Union and Syria and pointed out that it would be wrong to state that the views held by the two nations on the Middle East situation and prospects for its settlement are identical.

But, the Soviet ambassador said, there are no unsurmountable differences between the Soviet Union and Syria.

Egypt's Document on Palestinian Problem Explained

PM2009095189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Belyakov: "Around the '10 points'"]

[Text] Cairo, September—In recent weeks the Egyptian "working document" on the Palestinian problem has been the focus of diplomatic activity in the Near East. It has been brought to the notice of the PLO, Israel, and other interested parties.

This 10-point document hinges on the idea of holding elections on the Palestinian lands occupied by Israel. It was put forward back in April by Israeli Premier Y. Shamir in response to the PLO "peace offensive." According to Shamir's design, the Palestinian population's elected representatives should then enter into talks with Israel concerning the territories' autonomy. All this on condition that an end is put to the intifadah—the Palestinians' uprising on the occupied territories. The "Shamir plan" was rejected by the PLO on the grounds that under conditions of occupation elections cannot be free and democratic, although the Palestinians did not reject the actual idea of elections.

It was then that Egyptian diplomacy stepped forward. Maintaining relations with both the PLO and Israel, Egypt is well acquainted with their positions. Thus there was born the "working document" designed, according to UPI, "to make the Israeli idea of elections more acceptable to the PLO." It envisages ensuring the candidates at the elections with freedom of expression and the elected representatives with personal safety, inviting observers from other countries to the elections, withdrawing Israeli troops from the places where the polling stations are situated for the duration of the voting, and restricting Israelis' entry onto the occupied territories on that day. In Egypt's opinion, the inhabitants of East Jerusalem, annexed by Israel, should also take part in the elections. The Israeli Government must acknowledge the results of the elections, whatever they may be, and then begin talks with the elected Palestinian representatives on a definitive settlement and the talks must be completed within 3-5 years.

The Egyptian "working document" also contains two points which go beyond the framework of the idea of elections. Above all there is the proposal to end the Israeli colonization of the occupied Palestinian lands. In addition Egypt urges Israel to officially recognize the principle of "peace in exchange for territories" as the basis for a definitive settlement.

There has so far been no official reaction from the PLO and Israel to the Egyptian "working document." At its session in Tunis last week the PLO Executive Committee expressed itself in favor of Palestinian-Israeli dialogue and formulated four principles for such dialogue. The first is that the Palestinian delegation must include representatives not only from the occupied territories but also from outside them. Second, there should be no preliminary conditions like the acceptance of the "Shamir plan." Third, the possibility of holding elections should be examined in the context of an all-embracing settlement. And, fourth, this dialogue should not replace an international conference on the Near East.

As for the Egyptian "working document," the PLO Executive Committee has decided to submit it for examination by the PLO central council, which will be convened in the middle of October. In the opinion of a number of observers, this decision is evidence that there is no single opinion in the PLO leadership with regard to the Egyptian plan. Meanwhile President H. Mubarak has already had three meetings in September with Y. 'Arafat—once in Tunis and twice in Cairo—in an attempt to ensure the PLO's support for this plan.

Nor is there unity among the Israeli leadership with regard to the "working document." Keen discussions are under way on this subject between the two main components of the government coalition—the "Likud" bloc and the Labor Party. Representatives of the Labor Party headed by deputy premier S. Peres believe this document to be a suitable basis for initiating talks. The head of government, Y. Shamir, and other "Likud" representatives do not share that view.

Explaining their initiative, Egyptian officials note that it does not contradict the idea of convening an international peace conference on the Near East, which is widely recognized in the world. But the fact that the "working document" makes no mention of a conference is drawing attention. The Egyptian press, too, has been mentioning it considerably more rarely recently than early this year. Yet the holding of elections on occupied Palestinian lands is obviously not an essential condition either for convening an international conference or for the definitive settlement of the conflict.

Mubarak Plan Said To Split Israeli Government

PM2009162389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA PRESS SERVICE report: "Mubarak Plan Will Be Discussed"]

[Text] It has been announced in Tel Aviv that Israeli Defense Minister Yitzhaq Rabin will arrive in Cairo 18 September on a working visit. The purpose of the trip is to discuss the peace initiatives put forward recently by Egyptian President Husni Mubarak, geared to solving the Palestinian problem.

Last Friday Egypt officially presented its proposals on this score to the Israeli side, and the press has already christened them the "Mubarak plan." The 10-point proposals envisage the creation of the requisite conditions for holding elections in Israeli-occupied Arab territories. They include, in particular, an appeal to Israel to permit Arabs from east Jerusalem to participate in the elections, to put a stop to the practice of creating Jewish settlements in the occupied territories, and to accept the principle of exchanging occupied lands for a peace agreement.

The Egyptian proposals, according to the REUTER agency, have brought the Israeli Government to the brink of a split. Cabinet ministers from the "Likud" bloc of right-wing parties, headed by Y. Shamir, categorically rejected them, while representatives of the Israeli Labor Party regard the "Mubarak plan" as totally acceptable. Shim'on Peres, leader of the Labor Party, deputy prime minister, and minister of finance, expressed a high opinion of the Egyptian side's proposals and said that they could represent a basis for holding elections.

At the end of last week there was a tempestuous debate involving four key Israeli Government ministers: Y. Shamir, S. Peres, M. Arens, and Y. Rabin. But, according to the Egyptian paper AL-AHRAM, they have not yet managed to devise a common stance. The danger of a government split remains. In this connection Rabin's trip is seen primarily as an opportunity to find a way of reaching a mutually acceptable compromise which would make it possible to resolve the crisis within the Israeli cabinet.

As for the PLO's reaction to the "Mubarak plan," as Sa'id Kamal, the organization's representative in Cairo, has said, the PLO leadership does not intend to announce its opinion on the proposed peace initiatives until they have been carefully studied. It trusts the Egyptian Government and believes that Egypt supports the Palestinian people's cause.

Moscow TV Interviews Jerusalem Mayor Kollek

LD1709215389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 17 Sep 89

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov, including video report by correspondent Yevgeniy Kisilev in Jerusalem with interview of Jerusalem Mayor Teddy Kollek—Kollek speaks in English with superimposed Russian translation]

[Excerpts] [Gerasimov] On Thursday Israel launched a missile over a distance of 1,300 kilometers. The Soviet Union and the United States are destroying medium and

shorter range missiles while Israel is testing them. At the same time it possesses the technical base for the development of nuclear weapons, and according to some information it already has a nuclear device. Add the two things together and you get a new nuclear danger. The missiles were launched from near Jerusalem toward the Mediterranean Sea north of [word indistinct]. But let us leave to one side for a moment the problems of creeping missile technology and look at the ancient city which has been a kind of blind spot on our television screens—particularly at present:

[Correspondent Yevgeniy Kiselev, identified by screen caption] Jerusalem—the holy city, the center of three world religions, Christianity, Islam, and Judaism. It is a city where episodes from the gospels seem to come to life, where the grave of our Lord, the Wailing Wall and the Mosque of Omar appear before your very eyes, a city which for centuries has drawn unto itself pilgrims from throughout the world, including our own country, and where a Russian church mission and a convent still function today. [passage omitted] [video shows ancient sites in Jerusalem the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Wailing Wall, the Mosque of Omar, a Russian church, and monastery. Video goes on to show Kiselev standing in Jerusalem at a spot where the border between Israeli and Arab Jerusalem ran before the 1967 6-day war; archive film showing David Ben Gurion declaring the setting up of the state of Israel in 1948 and scenes showing the Arab attack upon Israel that ensued; archive film of the 6-day war which led to Israeli seizure of East Jerusalem. Video then shows Kiselev with Jerusalem Mayor Teddy Kollek]

[Kiselev] What problems has the intifadah [uprising] presented for you?

[Kollek] There are serious problems, although they cannot be compared with those that exist on the occupied territories. I will give the following fact, a very sad one though it may be. Throughout the whole time of the intifadah just six people have been killed in Jerusalem—four Jews and two Arabs. This simply cannot be compared with the hundreds of casualties on the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip. Of course Jews are rather afraid now of going into the Arab part of the city, but I move along all these streets and districts without any guard. Nothing happens, it's all quite alright. There aren't any guards in this building, either.

[Kiselev] Yes, that surprised me.

[Kollek] I don't know what things are like in your country, but there can't be many cities in the world where you could enter the municipality building so freely, particularly if disturbances like the ones we have are taking place. But, alas, the foreigners are frightened of coming here, and so tourism has fallen off.

[Kiselev] Indeed, when my friends in Moscow learned that I was planning to go to Jerusalem the first reaction of many of them was to ask whether I was afraid.

[Kollek] Well, are you afraid?

[Kiselev] No, I have to admit that I feel quite safe strolling along the streets of Jeusalem in the evening—calmer, even, than I do in some of the districts of Moscow at night. [video shows Kiselev and Kollek on a balcony overlooking the city of Jerusalem] [passage omitted]

The Palestinians are seeking national sovereignty, the creation of their own state, and, as it transpires from the decision of the Palestine National Council, they want to see its capital in East Jerusalem. Of course, Jerusalem's problems are also to a large extent both religious and emotional ones: They are not simply political. The Arabs have their own arguments; the Israelis have theirs.

[Kollek] The capital of Saudi Arabia is neither in Mecca nor Medina. It is not obligatory to have one's capital in a holy city. I understand that this is a holy city for the Arabs. That is precisely the attitude we should have toward it, we must respect these feelings, just as we must respect the feelings of Christians, for whom Jerusalem is also a holy city. But that must in no way influence the political side of the matter. The Arabs were in possession of East Jerusalem until 1967. Why did they not make Jerusalem the capital then? In the distant past, too, the Arabs were in Jerusalem for several hundred years: They did not have a capital here then, either. I consider that we have to make many concessions, we have to agree to many compromises, but Jerusalem without any doubt must remain a united city. We will not allow Jerusalem to be divided again, and it will remain the capital of Israel. [video again shows Kiselev talking to Kollek on balcony]

[Kiselev] Changes which quite recently would have seemed unthinkable are taking place now in Israeli public opinion. In opinion polls approximatley half of the Israelis are in favor of withdrawing from the occupied territories. Many are also in agreement with the idea of a Palestinian state being set up. Some are even prepared to start a dialogue with the PLO. But as far as the destiny of Jerusalem is concerned, here they are perhaps united and filled with resolve to oppose the whole world: For even the United States, Israel's closest ally, has not recognized the decision of the Knesset, which in 1980 annexed East Jerusalem de jure and declared the city to be the single and eternal capital of Israel. [video shows Jerusalem street scenes; demonstrators at meeting; U.S. consulate building; placards held by demonstrators saying "Reagan Stop Pressure"]

The position of the Arabs is equally irreconcilable. So the question of the destiny of Jerusalem has now been put into the background, as it were: In time it could become the main stumbling block on the road to a settlement and it is possible that those cautious scentics who predict that a new generation of politicians will be needed to find a compromise, people unburdened by the bloody history of Jewish-Arab strife, will turn out to be right here.

[video shows demonstrating and stone throwing arabs; security forces confronting them]

Reported Israeli Missile Launch Draws Reactions

TA1709175089 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1500 GMT 17 Sep 89

[Aleksandr Kushnir commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] TASS has reported that according to the Soviet Defense Ministry, Israel last Thursday launched a ballistic missile with a range of 1,300 km. The missile was launched from the Jerusalem area and landed in the Mediterranean 400 km north of Benghazi, Libya. TASS said Israel launched a similar missile in January 1988. The Israeli Army command's spokesman, on the other hand, reported that he had no information about such a launch.

The AP news agency recalls in this context that since the mid-1980's the media have frequently reported Israel's development of missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads.

We would like to remind our listeners that 2 years ago, in the summer of 1987, Israel tested a Jericho-2 missile. Our radio station then broadcast a commentary pointing to the danger to Israel from the launching of a missile capable of carrying nuclear arms. We pointed out, for instance, that such missiles are capable of reaching Soviet territory, and that our country could not turn a deaf ear to that.

The commentary drew the attention of Israeli media. Following the controversy, Shim'on Peres, who was then foreign minister, found it necessary to issue an announcement saying that Israel poses no threat to our country. He also declared that Israel favors transforming the Mediterranean's eastern basin into an area demilitarized of weapons of mass destruction.

This announcement, as Soviet Foreign Ministry representatives pointed out at the time, was received with satisfaction in our country. We believe now, just as we did then, that not being a large country but with a dense population, Israel must avoid a nuclear arms race, since the outbreak of a nuclear conflict in the Middle East could bring a holocaust. Now, there is the latest report that Israel has launched a ballistic missile. Our radio station does not take responsibility for determining which report is correct, that of the Soviet Defense Ministry on the missile launch, or of Israel's Defense Ministry, which said it had no information about it. But it is a fact, and there is much evidence to show, that in its level of militarization, Israel takes first place in the world. In other words, per capita military expenditures in Israel are the highest anywhere. It is also a fact that Israel's strategic ally has coopted it into the century's biggest arms program, the Strategic Defense Initiative, known as "Star Wars."

The above cannot but arouse a lack of confidence in Israel among the publics of various countries, including the Soviet public. We would not, of course, wish to teach Israel what is good for it and what is bad, but we agree with the positions of those in Israel who believe its continued armament, especially the development of its nuclear missile potential, constitutes a mortal threat to Israel and to the countries in the Middle East in general. It is obvious that to deliver the Middle East from the growing violence and tension, progressive forces in Israel, which point to the defects of militarization, also demand an end to the ruling circles' policy of occupation. It should be admitted that to achieve peace with the Arabs, Israel does not need an arms race; even more so it does not need to convert it into a nuclear missile problem.

During Israel's 41-year history weapons have not brought it peace or security, and we would like to believe that the report on the launch of the ballistic missile is a mistake.

Shevardnadze Message to Omani Minister of State

JN1609154689 Muscat Domestic Service in Arabic 1300 GMT 16 Sep 89

[Text] His Excellency Yusuf ibn-'Alawi ibn-'Abdallah, minister of state for foreign affairs, received a written message from His Excellency Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, which concerns bilateral relations, means of bolstering them, and topics of mutual interest.

His excellency the minister of state received the message at his office this

Sub-Saharan Africa

Progress of Carter-Sponsored Ethiopia Talks Noted

PM2009150189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by own correspondent G. Ustinov followed by report by unnamed TASS correspondents under the general heading: "The Echo of Atlanta"]

[Text] Addis Ababa—There are no mailmen in the Ethiopian capital and even subscribers buy their newspapers at kiosks, along with ordinary purchasers. For perfectly obvious reasons, the lines outside newspaper kiosks have been particularly long in Addis Ababa of late. People are waiting for the latest reports from the U.S. city of Atlanta.

It is true, though, that the news on the talks between the government delegation and representatives of the Eritrean opposition is meager and unattributed, despite the fact that there are Ethiopian journalists in Atlanta at the moment. Workers' Party of Ethiopia [WPE] Central Committee Secretary Ashagre, leader of the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia delegation, speaking at

the latest press conference, put it down to the fact that the sides had agreed not to divulge details of the talks until they are over.

But, ultimately, what is important is not what kind of auditorium the government and Eritrean delegates are working in, what the ceiling is like, and whether the windows let in enough light. Far more important is the fact that the Ethiopian people are tired of the 28-year war, which is Africa's longest. Many families on both sides have lost fathers in it in the past, and now they are losing sons. All past experience clearly and convincingly demonstrates that no one can win the war and that the conflict will not be settled by military means.

I would describe the Ethiopian public's current mood as one of anxious optimism. It may sound paradoxical, but here is the explanation: All the reports from Atlanta say that the talks are progressing pretty successfully, in an atmosphere of mutual understanding. But it was originally decided that they would end on Monday 11 September, having started on 7 September. Then they were extended for 2 days. The latest is that they will resume on Tuesday 19 September, after a 3-day break. Which means that it is not all plain sailing, that compromises are proving very difficult to reach.

Let us clarify the situation by saying that the current talks between the opposing sides at the "Carter Center," and with the former U.S. president as intermediary, are of a preparatory, to some extent procedural nature. They began without any preliminary conditions, as was proposed by the Ethiopian parliament—the Shengo—in June. The participants want to strike up a relationship of trust and to know one another's platforms better. There are 13 items on the agenda and, according to the latest reports from Atlanta, agreement has been reached on 10 of them. In particular, both sides have agreed that the next main stage of the talks will take place not in the United States, but much closer to Ethiopia. Kenya, Sudan, Egypt, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, and the Yemen Arab Republic [YAR] are named as possible options.

But the venue is not that vital. It is vital, however, to ensure a continuous negotiating process, which would be an important guarantee of the current, as yet very young and fragile peace in this explosive region. So it is important not to postpone the meeting for too long. But there has been no news so far of the date of the new stage of the talks.

But the echo of Atlanta is giving rise to hope in Ethiopia. As President Mengistu Haile Mariam, first secretary of the WPE Central Committee, said in his recent speech at the 15th revolution anniversary celebrations, the Ethiopian people want to end the war and achieve a lasting peace and will pay any price.

Addis Ababa, 18 September—The Yemen Arab Republic [YAR] has come out in support of Ethiopia's territorial integrity and against the separatist aspirations of groupings operating in the province of Eritrea. This was stated here on Sunday by Ethiopian delegation head Kassa Kebede, member of the WPE Central Committee, on his return from the YAR. Yemen President 'Ali 'Abdallah Salih and other officials confirmed their firm position to the effect that any solution of the problem of northern Ethiopia must be based on the country's inviolable unity. The YAR president has taken steps to get the leaders of San'a-based Eritrean separatist movements to start peace talks with the Ethiopian Government.

South African President's Promises Evaluated

MB1509195989 Moscow in Zulu to Southern Africa 1930 GMT 14 Sep 89

[Boris Asoyan commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] Frederick de Klerk was confirmed as president of South Africa today.

Very few envy his task. He is undoubtedly like a car speeding toward a cliff.

Former South African President Pieter Botha once noted that white South Africans must adapt to changing situations or die. Today, a new direction is needed, and there is no room for delay. There is no alternative but to take steps toward genuine reform.

This fact obviously has dawned on the ruling National Party [NP] in South Africa. Frederick de Klerk's determination to fulfill his promise to build a new South Africa brings joy to South Africa's peoples and to progressive organizations in the country and those who have fought apartheid diligently.

The new president's promises are in line with changing perceptions of the future.

Is he convicted enough not to turn the clock back, like his predecessors, among them Pieter Botha? A quick look at the situation indicates that De Klerk's stand does not give whites much comfort about the future of the country.

The NP was voted in by under 50 percent of the white electorate; about 30 percent gave their vote to the Conservative Party [CP], and 20 percent voted for the Democratic Party [DP]. To carry out his plans, De Klerk will have to clarify himself to the majority. Although De Klerk has shown he is determined to carry out reform, in the last 41 years he has shown support for the CP, making it difficult to believe that his present views are born of a realization that there is no other way out but reform for the apartheid government.

It is still difficult today to comprehend his interpretation of genuine reform, protection of white political rights, and elimination of apartheid. Much is unclear on his intentions concerning the protection of group rights, and the record of the NP on this issue causes unease, as does his adamant stand against legalizing the ANC [African National Congress] and holding talks with this organization on the future of this country.

Providence has made De Klerk leader of the whites at this very crucial and ldifficult time. Only time will tell whether he will be able to steer the country to the safe shores of a new South Africa. Many have hope that there will be change for the better in the politics of this nation.

Will De Klerk be able to avoid falling prey to the apartheid monster, and lead us to a new South Africa within the time allotted him?

Further Commentary on De Klerk

MB1509150489 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 14 Sep 89

[Aleksandr Fedorov commentary; from the "South Africa Today" program—read by announcer]

[Text] For the last few days, Frederick de Klerk has been receiving many congratulatory telegrams in relation to his election as president to the Republic of South Africa.

Behind their diplomatic politeness would be implied the hope that he will not go along the well-beaten track of his predecessors. For the leaders of the Western countries, the changes in South Africa will be like a justification of the long, downright refusal for taking action on sanctions. For South Africa's neighbors, these changes could be a guarantee that the talks with Mr de Klerk, when he was acting president, were not a waste of time. The liberal white opposition, which cautiously spoke dialogue, equal rights for the country's population, and were considered [word indistinct] in the time of Pieter Botha, spoke about it for all to hear during the election campaign.

The Africans to whom De Klerk has promised revolutionary changes want to believe that it's not just election talk which will be forgotten 2 days after the election victory.

I think that the election of President Frederick de Klerk will not pass by unnoticed in the Soviet Union. For many years, our country has not supported diplomatic relations with South Africa because of its apartheid policy. In the last couple of months, contact has been made on various levels quite often, and this has given some people cause to maintain that the Soviet Union is representing the interests of the African National Congress [ANC]. I am sure that both the black and white population in South Africa correctly understood the explanation of Soviet diplomat [word indistinct]. The Soviet Union has shown its aspirations for peace and the settlement of regional conflicts and has not weakened in support of the ANC in its speaking out for the elimination of apartheid.

Apartheid is like a regional reason for their destabilization of the situation in the region and the slavelike conditions of millions of Africans in South Africa. We are for contact with South Africa with its [word indistinct] intelligent people, free from prejudice about its ethnic and historical discrimination.

I can understand that in a country where [word indistinct] there has been propaganda about the aggressive red bear that not all people would believe in the good intentions of the Soviet Union, but stereotypes have been [word indistinct] by positive actions. The first steps have already been taken, and that was when our country cooperated in undoing the tangled knot of Namibia, when representatives of our people's diplomacy and public organizations sat down at the roundtable.

Just a few days before the opening session of the South African Parliament, the stance of the African Service of Radio Moscow took a poll of 100 [word indistinct] Moscow [word indistinct] about what they knew about South Africa. The results showed they knew little. But, nearly all of them maintained that the worst form of apartheid reigned in the country. It is interesting that 60 percent of them have heard of Frederick de Klerk and said that he could do something to change the life of his country.

It would be great to believe it. I have gained the impression from watching many of the interviews with Mr de Klerk on television that he is a pleasant and intelligent man, who can make his ideas clear in both languages. Also of importance is that he is educated, a born leader, and in this he is different form many of the South African politicians, who often simply repaint what they learned in their childhood from the facist principles of their fathers and the ideologists of apartheid [word indistinct] I'd like to repeat that this is my personal impression. It would be good if it turns out to be true.

As we hear about such things, time will tell, and in South Africa [word indistinct] very quickly [word indistinct] it can become the explosive situations. It's now time when the changes in the destiny of millions of the black and the white population of South Africa [word indistinct] not only form subjective but objective factors.

East Europe

Demonstrations Mark Polish Partition Anniversary

PM2009145789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Toporkov dispatch: "Fifty Years Ago. How Poland Observed 17 September"]

[Text] Warsaw—During these fall days, two dates could be glimpsed in articles in newspapers and journals and heard in television and radio speeches and all kinds of meetings between veterans and young people: 1 and 17 September 1939. Expressions such as "two imperialist marauders" who tore Poland to pieces were used. That means Germany and the USSR. It was stated that the ideological positions of the two totalitarian systems came down to one thing—destroying Poland.

Reading and listening to all this, you find yourself thinking: In the numerous speeches you cannot even find

a mention of what happened afterward, of who it was, all the same, that liberated Poland from the Hitlerite invaders, who gave up the lives of over 600,000 Soviet servicemen killed and buried on Polish soil because of this. Only one thing was stressed: The Soviet Union, just like fascist Germany, was an aggressor against Poland.

The emotions of Polish readers and listeners at this time have become exceptionally charged. An avalanche of material has descended on them, stigmatizing the USSR and containing no praise for a people with whom Poland was necessarily in the same camp and whom it joined in victory, despite the recent dramas. Who could fail to understand that, without the titanic efforts and sacrifices of the Soviet people, freedom could not have come to Poland?

You get the impression that the most important thing is being put into the background and that the problems concerning 17 September are being overemphasized and taken out of the whole context of historical events. Several times I happened to hear from Poles themselves that such a position inevitably leads to deformations of the social psychology. Is this not why the cemeteries where Soviet soldiers are buried have been defiled, and why somehow you do not hear about such things happening with the graves of German soldiers?

This is what comes to mind in summing up 17 September 1989. This day abounded in "religious-patriotic demonstrations," as the acts of worship, rallies, and street processions against what is called the "fourth partition of Poland," "Poland's death sentence," "the stab in the back," and "the Soviets' greatest, unjustifiable crime" were called. Particularly notable demonstrations of people in extremist moods were held in Warsaw, Krakow, and Gdansk. The slogans were the usual ones: "Soviets—Go home!" In Lublin the demonstrators demanded that the monument dedicated to Soviet soldiers be destroyed. In Katowice young people smashed the windows of a building housing one of the services of the USSR Trade Legation. In Warsaw, a group of young people tried to display their dislike of the USSR at the Soviet Embassy.

Komsomol Condemns Anti-Soviet Attitude

LD2009213889 Warsaw PAP in English 1705 GMT 20 Sep 89

[By PAP Correspondent Jerzy Malczyk]

[Text] Moscow, Sept. 20—The Central Committee of the Komsomol and the committee of USSR's youth organizations have issued a statement condemning the anti-Soviet attitude displayed by certain Polish youth groups and calling on all youth movements in Poland interested in cooperation with the Soviet Union to show goodwill and come out against provocative anti-Soviet actions.

At the same time, the Soviet youth organizations declared their readiness to develop friendly contacts with their counterparts in Poland.

"We know that there were difficult moments in the history of Polish-Soviet relations," the statement read in part, "but thinking about the future, the young generations in Poland and the USSR should take possession of what links our countries, what can constitute a basis for the present times, accelerate the march into the future and become an example of serving their nations."

Party Renewal, Problems Debated at PZPR Plenum

PM2109131189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Sep 89 Morning Edition p4

[Own correspondent L. Toporkov dispatch: "For a Renewed Party of Left-Wing Forces"]

[Text] Warsaw—The Polish United Workers Party (PZPR) Central Committee plenum which opened 18 September has begun practical preparations for the 11th PZPR Congress.

The PZPR policy designed to achieve national accord, reform, and democratization is evidence that the party is capable of admitting its mistakes and renouncing its monopoly on power. M. Rakowski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, said in a television speech on the eve of the 15th Central Committee plenum. The party is renouncing this monopoly and also any vestiges of outmoded doctrines and schemes. A difficult situation has now taken shape in the party. On the one hand, it is being attacked by those who feel bitter about their defeat and do not agree with the political and economic reforms. They do not understand that a specific era has come to an end in the history in the party, which, if it did not embark on a course of renewal and reform, would die from infirmity of age or from conflict with the inevitable social outburst. On the other hand, M. Rakowski said, the party is coming under attack from the recent opposition because the PZPR did battle with it until quite recently. Now at the helm of power, yesterday's opposition still has not appreciated that the state and the people must have an interest in an effective party of Polish left-wing forces and not in a weak PZPR that is on the decline.

So, the words have been said: a strong, renewed party. Many people in the PZPR are now in favor of building such a party. That party must be founded on a broader social base than before. It must have a clear, pragmatic program opposed to conservative, nationalist trends imbued with reaction and intolerance. It will represent the achievements of enlightened, progressive thought and the hopes and aspirations of the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia.

The 15th PZPR Central Committee Plenum also focused attention on the discussion of a wide range of problems connected with the party's renewal and its mode of action in the new conditions. The opening speech was given by L. Miller, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee. Analyzing the present situation in the

country, he spoke in support of T. Mazowiecki's government, noting that the party will assess it on the basis of facts and results. As for the PZPR, L. Miller spoke of the need to decisively reconstruct the party and, with the participation of other left-wing forces, to create a new socialist party. But not on the ruins of the PZPR, he stressed.

More people are involved in the work of the plenum than usual. Members of the PZPR Parliamentary Club, representatives of the biggest enterprises' party committees, and the leaders of various initiative groups offering their own vision of the party's future have all been invited to the plenum (incidentally, the opening of the plenum was attended for the first time by foreign correspondents, including Western correspondents, who spent an hour listening to speeches by Central Committee members). Among these informal groups two stand out: the Krakow "8 June Movement" and the Warsaw "8 July Movement," which are named for the date they came into being. They are in favor of a new look for the party and a change of name. The Open Precongress Forum has been set up, which is calling for discussions. It is being pointed out that the party's weak spots are its outmoded structures, its statute, its persisting dogmatism, and its post-Stalinist legacy of practices and customs which serve a bureaucratic machine alienated from the party masses.

The discussion at the plenum has touched on every aspect of party life in the changed political and social climate. What direction is the quest taking? Here is one view, expressed by Professor of Philosophy at Jagiellonian University J. Lipiec, member of the PZPR Central Committee Ideology Commission:

"The new party must be oriented toward the growing social vanguard and those groups which are concerned with the modern spheres of production and services. Socialists and social democrats could be involved in forming this party—not just members of the PZPR. The new party program—clear and intelligible to all—must be verified as quickly as possible rather than taking an age over it. Party membership must depend on approval of its political program and not on ideological and philosophical views. We must renounce monitoring ideological reliability and an organizational structure for the party based on grassroots organizations in the work place and move to the territorial principle."

Dozens of people have spoken during the discussion, which has been very stormy at times. The plenum has decided to conduct a kind of internal party referendum among party members so that when it resumes work at the end of September it will be armed with collective wisdom for continuing the discussion about the party and preparations for the 11th PZPR Congress.

PZPR Aide Queried on Restructuring of Party

18070766 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 37, 16-22 Sep 89 p 2

[Report on interview with Marek Krol, PPR Sejm deputy, PZPR Central Committee secretary, by INTERPRESS correspondent Jan Cichocki: "Toward a New Type of Party"; place, date not specified]

[Text]**At our request, Polish INTERPRESS agency correspondent Jan Cichocki met with Marek Krol, PPR [Polish People's Republic] Sejm deputy, PZPR [Polish United Workers Party] Central Committee secretary.**

[Cichocki] Since its election defeat, the PZPR has lost its leadership position in the government coalition, and is now forced to make due with a place in a number of parties. Has the PZPR in some way taken this lesson into consideration? How do you plan to act under the new conditions?

[Krol] We do not feel that the party is beyond the pale, and can now be taken out of the equation. Moreover, we are not speaking of some sort of deviation. On the contrary, the new situation has created a new quality: The PZPR is being transformed from a party which had historically-received power into a de facto party.

We plan to seek the compromise solutions which would guarantee the PZPR a significant place in the process of reforming socialism, and not cause social conflicts, and which at the same time would be acceptable to the other side. The fact that only the interests of society and the people are the party's highest interests is at the basis of the actions. For the party, power itself is not a goal, but only a means of putting into practice the values inherent in socialism.

[Cichocki] The change in the PZPR's position in the country's political structure has caused an unhealthy reaction among its members; a portion of communists has expressed deep disappointment and pessimism, some have been hurt in support of reformist trends.

[Krol] Our party has until now functioned under comfortable conditions; it has not had real opposition. A leading role was prepared for it, and those who are now trying to "protest" have never been sick at heart for the party's cause.

All of this led to the PZPR's loss of its political instinct. And instead of being a political party in the true sense of that word, the PZPR turned into some sort of super-institution. We forgot that power is never granted forever; society's support should always be earned, and new supporters cared for.

Nevertheless, I do not feel that our position is so very tragic; the bucket of cold water which society has thrown at us substantially affects the process of forming a new type of party. It cannot be excluded that the party will come out under a different name, and undoubtedly, with a different conception of activity. I feel that this is the

party's main chance—on the condition, of course, that we once and for all reject the bureaucratic methods by which we have compromised ourselves, and make a transition to political methods.

In Poland, there is no shortage of progressive, leftist forces. They must just be reorganized.

[Cichocki] And how do you view the party of Polish leftists?

[Krol] If I could answer that question, I think that there would be no need for the 11th Party Congress. One thing is clear: The new principles of party organization must be sufficiently open; they must not be narrowed down to any group or stratum of society.

The PZPR's most important mistakes were its ossification and dogmatism. Many of the "Solidarity" figures were former party members who had found no place for themselves in the party, even though they were firmly intertwined with leftist thinking. They were decisively opposed to an attempt to restore capitalism, for example, in the form of a transition to private education or private health care. We must attract to the party both those who have left it, and those who have not entered it because they felt that within the PZPR there is not, nor can there be a free exchange of opinions.

[Cichocki] It is one thing to gear toward those who left the party, or those who have not yet joined, but restructuring those who are in the party is something else.

[Krol] I agree with you. There are very different people in the party. There are comrades whose consciences were formed in the fifties and sixties on the principles which we now renounce. But in the party there is also a significant number of young people who will adapt to the new conditions very quickly, and who want to give all of their efforts to the renaissance of the party's authority.

In addition, it should be made clear whether the millions of leaders on all levels maintain their ideological link with the party, or if they entered it only for mercenary motives, in order to get into the nomenklatura; party membership would guarantee them this position. The processes now taking place will test this.

[Cichocki] The view is widespread that in light of the emergence of new parties, for example, the Christian Party, that the end is coming to socialism in Poland.

[Krol] I feel that a departure from socialism does not threaten Poland. On the other hand, we are threatened by failure of the reforms worked out by the party, and stagnation in implementing what the PZPR has begun. The cause of the stagnation may be a political struggle for hegemony, or one force's attempts to monopolize political life.

First Steps of Polish Cabinet Scrutinized

PM2009140989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Sep 89 Second Edition p 6

[Correspondent A. Starukhin dispatch: "Government's First Steps. Poland Faced With Crisis Problems"]

[Text] Warsaw—While delivering his program speech in parliament, Tadeusz Mazowiecki, Poland's new prime minister, suddenly felt unwell. He apologized and asked for a short break, quick-wittedly joking at the same time that he was now feeling on a par with the state of the Polish economy.

Indeed, the government cabinet of 23 ministers, which has just been formed, is beginning its work in a situation characterized by many "sore points." These include foreign debts running to many billions, unrestrainedly rising prices, and inflation.

Let us recall that in T. Mazowiecki's cabinet 12 portfolios have gone to representatives of "Solidarity," 4 each to the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] and the United Peasant Party, and 3 to the Democratic Party.

As is customary, the new ministers have begun by "visiting" their own collectives. It is again being emphasized that staffers will be assessed on their businesslike qualities, competence, and loyalty to the programs and the new principles of government. Employees are being urged not to panic, although it is not easy for them to maintain their mental equilibrium either. The apparatus of the Ministry of Foreign Economic Cooperation, for example, has been reduced to 300 staffers. In the opinion of its head, M. Swiecicki, it now appears the most dynamic and young.

On appointing the finance minister as one of his three deputies, T. Mazowiecki explained this as follows: Through the Finance Ministry it is proposed to control the country's entire economy. Minister L. [initial as published] Balcerowicz himself in turn considers it necessary to limit budget expenditure. In general, the cabinet's desire to create a more economical management structure can be seen from the first steps. It has been deemed necessary to merge the ministries of agriculture and the environment. The post of minister-member of the Council of Ministers for cooperation with the trade unions has been abolished: These functions have been transferred to the Ministry of Labor and Social Security.

There is evidence of certain support "from below," so to speak—the principle of a broad coalition may be working. Thus a Polish parliamentary fund for the development of the countryside and agriculture has been instituted. It will be formed from money obtained from selling food delivered free from other countries, as well as money obtained as a result of economic activity by the fund itself. The money will go to develop the network of small processing industry enterprises, of which there is an acute shortage today, as well as for the accelerated

development of the rural infrastructure and of production facilities serving the countryside. The following fact has also become known: A group of peasants has proposed to the government that they will dispatch additional grain in return for payment to be received only next year. This, I believe, is not just material credit but also a kind of credit of confidence in the authorities. People are giving the new leadership a chance to become firmly established and to achieve positive results by way of economic reform.

Much is being written in the local and foreign press today about the West's resumption of financial aid to Poland. Ex-President V. Giscard d'Estaing of France recently called for the Polish Government to be given economic support. Frans Andriessen, vice president of the EEC Commission, arrives in Warsaw on the 18th with a view to signing a treaty "On Trade and Economic Cooperation" between Poland and his organization. The Poles themselves have estimated that they need $10 billion, for example, to modernize industry and introduce new technologies and for other purposes associated with improving the economy. The U.S. President has promised to double food aid. It has turned out, however, that his original starting point was of little significance: just $50 million... As a Polish publicist remarked, bearing Western countries' aid in mind, "in all probability, very little rain will fall from a large cloud." However, it is not customary to count other people's money; on the contrary, you must not forget your own debts. And these debts are impressive: $39.2 billion and 6.4 billion transfer rubles. As you see, there is a danger that the crisis will be further exacerbated.

The money and market situation in the country remains extremely strained. For example, prices rose 61 percent last year. And a further 80.7 percent during the first half of this year alone. But later still a huge wave of market prices, which leaped several-fold overnight, swamped Polish citizens on 1 August. The commodity imbalance is continuing to be aggravated. There is a shortage of clothes, footwear, furniture, consumer electronic apparatus, and household articles.

In this complex situation the PZPR, too, is trying increasingly persistently to define its place. On meeting with the party aktiv of Lodz Voivodship, PZPR Central Committee First Secretary M. Rakowski said: If we want to be equal to the transformations, it is not enough for us to replace people in their seats and change signboards, we must change our thinking. He pointed out that the publication of directives and instructions frequently used to take the place of political work and of involvement in the struggle for people's hearts and minds. Today the party is debating the unification of all left-wing forces.

West Europe

Former Aide to Shevardnadze Said To Defect in Rome

AU2109095889 Paris AFP in English 0920 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Excerpt] Rome, Sept 21 (AFP)—A Soviet official with ministerial rank and former aide to Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze has asked for asylum in the United States Embassy here, a reliable source said Thursday.

The U.S. Embassy could neither confirm nor deny the report while the Soviet Embassy said it was "not aware" of the reported defection.

The official was identified as Vladimir Alpenidze, 55, the chairman of the Soviet agency for royalties, whose job had ministerial rank.

Mr. Alpenidze was a personal advisor to Mr. Shevardnadze when the current Soviet Foreign Minister was serving as the Georgia republic's first secretary, the sources said.

He defected to the U.S. Embassy on the second day of a tourist visit to Rome which began in early September in the company of some 30 Soviet journalists, the sources said.

Mr. Alpenidze left most of his possessions in his hotel room and the Soviet Embassy has asked Italian authorities if he had requested asylum in Italy, the source said.

Police here said they were not aware of the reported defection. [passage omitted]

Two Members of Soviet Weightlifting Team Defect

LD2009114489 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Athens September 20 TASS—Why break into an open door? This is the question that sprang to mind the news of Soviet weightlifter after Khafiz Suleymanov's defection leaked out. [sentence as received]

Suleymanov was listed on the Soviet team for the world and European weightlifting championships in Athens and had already won the world crown, when together with Soviet national team masseur Vitaliy Stabrov he packed up and left to seek political asylum in the Turkish Embassy.

Both are currently staying at the embassy asking to be taken to Turkey.

The local newspaper RIZOSPASTIS said Suleymanov and his masseur chose a strange method of moving to another country.

The paper quoted the head of the Soviet delegation to the championships as saying that the defectors could simply return to the Soviet Union and then apply for emigration, a normal procedure nowadays. "No one would have tried to stop them. Times have changed and every person can live where he chooses," Parkhomenko said.

Some try to explain away Suleymanov's decision citing ethnic differences. Suleymanov comes from Azerbaijan. Then why did he defect in the company of a Russian masseur?

Suleymanov was recently often seen in the company of Turkish weightlifter Suleimanoglu, according to Ivan Abadjyev of the Bulgarian team. Suleimanoglu is a former Bulgarian citizen who now lives in Turkey. His defection once caused a huge propaganda campaign, he was adopted by Turkish Prime Minister Turgut Ozal. This time he arrived in Athens aboard a personal plane. It looks like Suleymanov was simply taken in by promises of a similar career.

Former teammates could not hide their dismay with this action.

"We worked together, helped him and he let us down," Soviet team doctor Dmitriy Blinov said. "However, I think this will not influence the team's performance. We had a team meeting, and the boys are set to win, yesterday's gold medal by Altiy Orazdurdyev proves this."

The presence of two foreign citizens in the Turkish Embassy in Athens has created a delicate situation, considering complex relations between Greece and Turkey. The embassy has been surrounded with police.

It is expected that the defectors will be taken to Ankara on a special plane due here from Turkey. The Turkish Government is now negotiating on this issue with the Greek Foreign Ministry, according to local press reports.

23 Sep Gorbachev-Thatcher Meeting Reviewed

LD2109062389 Moscow TASS in English 0602 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Igor Peskov:

The working meeting between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to be held in Moscow on September 23 accords with the development of Soviet-British relations over the past few years.

In the USSR, there is great interest in the working meeting. But special significance is attached to disarmament issues.

Although the views of the two countries do not always coincide, meetings between the leaders of the USSR and Britain have given an additional impetus to the search for compromise and points of contact.

The Soviet Union is interested in the way the British will act on the issue of reducing conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe in the light of the new round of Vienna talks.

The western plans to modernise nuclear short-range weapons, with Britain insisting on their implementation, are worrying the USSR which, naturally, is interested if there are any changes on this matter.

At the same time Moscow points to the positive role played by Britain at the conference on chemical weapons in Geneva, and the working meeting will probably discuss the prospects of these talks.

The Soviet Union is interested in cooperating with Britain in all-European affairs. This implies, primarily adding a practical aspect to the "European home" concept and prospects of integration processes in Europe in connection with the establishment of a united market there.

Special hopes are placed on bilateral cooperation in ecology, especially in the use of the U.N. mechanism for a coordinated effort to fight environmental pollution.

The Moscow meeting will undoubtedly discuss specific issues of Soviet-British cooperation, such as the establishment of joint ventures and Britain's assistance in training personnel.

This would be a practical realisation of the British Government's wish to facilitate the processes of perestroyka in the USSR, repeatedly expressed by Thatcher.

The British press is now speculating on whether the meeting between the two leaders will be able to dispel the "cool" in relations between the two countries following the expulsion of several Soviet officials from London last May.

In this light it is appropriate to observe that each country has the right to decide who should represent its interests abroad, which is in keeping with standards of civilised realtions and diplomacy.

The British are trying to assume the part of judge, a position to which the USSR strongly objects.

In Soviet diplomatic circles it is believed that these differences should not be viewed as an obstacle to the development of relations between the two nations.

French Communist Party's Marchais Interviewed

PM2009155389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[Interview with Georges Marchais, secretary general of the French Communist Party, by own correspondent V. Bolshakov in Paris: "Wherein Lies the Strength of French Communists"—no date of interview given; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] Georges Marchais, secretary general of the French Communist Party [PCF], consented to be interviewed at the L'HUMANITE festival, right after he had delivered a speech at the opening of the international village. One could feel that this festival was exceptionally important for him, primarily as a kind of review of the party forces, a practical test of the PCF's influence in the country. Therefore, the first question focused on this topic.

Question. The Communists' opponents have repeatedly spoken of the PCF's decline. But the 1989 L'HUMANITE festival has just reaffirmed that not only is the PCF's

influence not declining, it is actually growing. Where does the PCF draw its strength?

Answer. Indeed, the L'HUMANITE festival which has just ended was tremendously successful. We sold 647,000 tickets, 9,900 persons joined our party during the festival, and 7,700 joined the French Communist Youth Movement. These results are encouraging. Various elections have been held in our country in the past 2 years. With the exception of the extremely specific elections for the European Parliament, in which more than one-half of French people did not take part, we demonstrated a steady trend toward a new upsurge—7 percent of votes in April 1988 (first round of the presidential elections), 11 percent in June 1988 (National Assembly elections—Editorial Office note), and 13 percent in September 1988 (department elections). Moreover, we retained the bulk of Communist municipalities in March 1989. At the same time, we make no secret of the fact that quite a few more obstacles still have to be overcome. Let me dwell on this briefly.

The historical period in which we are living is marked by a profound crisis in French society. I do not mean "crisis" in a sense implying "catastrophe." France's problems are not the problems of "Third World" countries, it is and will remain one of the most developed countries. I am talking of a crisis in this sense: Society's problems have reached a point where the situation can no longer remain unchanged. Over the past 15 years, for example, priority has been given to the investment of financial capital, stock market speculation, and promotion of exports, in other words all the most profitable activities. This seriously disrupted the equilibrium in the economic and social spheres, a considerable proportion of France's wealth was squandered, unemployment—which now stands at 10 percent of the active population—has become a permanent feature, and the working people's purchasing power has declined. On the other hand, uncertainty in the future and social tension have increased.

Of course, the forces of capitalism are not passive in the face of this situation, engendered by their own policy. They resort to answers which boil down to one simple idea: Since society is in a de facto state of crisis of capitalism, and capitalism cannot be touched, then let society try and adapt itself to the new requirements of capitalism.

The main features of this "answer" by capitalism, which is offered in connection with the prospect of the creation of a single European market in 1993 [as published], is designed to offer fresh opportunities for domination and profit earning by multinational corporations like: reduction of people in their millions to a state of poverty, maintenance of the "austerity economics" policy, fresh mass cutbacks of jobs, elevation of the lack of stability to the status of a norm (jobs without any guarantees, which can be created and eliminated at the masters' will), intensive application of modern technologies not in order to alleviate people's labor but in order to superexploit them, curtailment of expenditure on social programs and of the programs themselves, segregation in schools and elitism in universities, infringement of democracy, expansion of the scale of phenomena like drug addiction, corruption, and racism, americanization of cultural life, and gradual loss of France's sovereignty and individuality.

This policy made it possible to sharply increase the profits of entrepreneurs and financiers and to achieve a slight economic boom, but at the same time it created greater difficulties for quite a sizeable number of people and contributed toward the country's lag. We are against seeing our society become more difficult to live in and less equal as a result of all this. This is why our policy is now determined by two objectives: to promote the rallying of all who wish to protect themselves from the misfortunes befalling them and to promote the rallying of the people's forces, of left-wing forces, in order to find a different solution to the problems facing us and to change policy, power, and society. There is no doubt that this task is not easy and will not become any easier, since the policy of capital is pursued in our country by a government of an alliance between the Socialist Party and a section of right-wing forces. But dissatisfaction with the prevailing situation is quite substantial now, the struggle is developing, and we are doing everything to ensure that our ideas are well known everywhere.

Question. There are numerous arguments now, in our own country and abroad, about the position of socialism in world history and our own history. The opponents of communism claim that the October 1917 Revolution was a mistake, that Russia should have gone no further than February 1917, in other words it should have rested satisfied with a bourgeois revolution. How would you reply to this kind of "argument?"

Answer. I would reply that history does not stand still. Had the October Revolution not been accomplished, your working class would have still been exploited, your peasantry would have still been enslaved, and the peoples of the Russian Empire would have still been colonized. The worldwide revolutionary movement would not have been given the mighty impetus which is characteristic of the 20th century. What stance would a capitalist Russia have taken toward fascism when it reared its head in the twenties and thirties? What world would we have been living in today?

It is better not to think of potential nightmares. Let us put it more simply: It is only thanks to the fact that the Soviet Union managed to rid itself of capitalism that a country which played a secondary role in 1917 managed to become the second mightiest world power, to make a decisive contribution toward the destruction of Nazism, and to maintain peace on our planet over the last 44 years. There can be no doubt at all that the building of Soviet socialism was long affected by Russia's history, its economic and cultural backwardness, its omnipotent bureaucracy, its traditions of political authoritarianism

and violence. Now the Soviet people have embarked on the final eradication of these birthmarks of the capitalist and even precapitalist past, which infected the socialist society, deformed it extensively, and are hindering its further development to this day. Of course, this was not expected by the opponents of communism of whom you spoke. They actually thought that Soviet people would feel nostalgia for capitalism and its archaic solutions, while the Soviet people have embarked—and sensibly at that—on a quest for really modern methods to solve their problems, socialist methods. As you can see, Lenin, the Bolsheviks, and all who accomplished the October revolution made the best possible choice.

Question. There is a considerable distance separating the proclamation of a revolutionary ideal and its actual implementation, both in the social sphere and in state structures. The 200th anniversary of the Great French Revolution was recently celebrated. Can it be said that its ideals have materialized in France?

Answer. I often use the following phrase in my speeches and statements: "Even two centuries after the revolution, many Bastilles have yet to fall." Yes, the republic's slogan of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" is a long way from implementation in our country.

Equality and fraternity: As I said, we are far from this. But it must also be borne in mind that in our country, the motherland of the Declaration of Human Rights, things are also not quite right as regards liberty. Of course, this problem must be correctly perceived: France is not a dictatorship, and democratic norms are observed here. At the same time, 55,000 trade union aktiv members have been sacked or deprived of work for the sole reason that they protected the interests of their work comrades. Authoritarianism, coercion, and quite frequently blackmail with the threat of unemployment are the law at enterprises. As regards social life, power is excessively concentrated in the hands of one man, his loyal followers who are ready to serve him, and the state's bureaucratic and technocratic apparatus. All this leads to society's profound depoliticization and the growing debasement of the very idea of "citizen."

It must be noted that, even though there is not and has not been another party in France which defends freedom as ours does, we have not always perceived this struggle as paramount in our policy. There were times when we used to describe as "bourgeois" those selfsame freedoms which the bourgeoisie itself trampled and continues to trample today. Much water has flowed under the bridges since those times, however. Now we are struggling to build by democratic means a socialism which will itself be democratic and self-managing. And we defend human freedoms and rights both in France and wherever else they are violated.

Question. How do you imagine socialism in French colors?

Answer. As the most exhaustive answer to the huge problems which France is facing and has yet to face, I have just spoken about our society's crisis and the ways in which capitalism is trying to solve it. But there are also other solutions, other responses to the challenges of the present.

Seeing that we live in a country possessing considerable wealth, internal resources, and development potential, the deepening of social inequality, the growth of unemployment, and other wrongs are not the best answer to the difficulties we encounter. The best answer lies in an economy geared not solely to financial gain, but primarily to satisfying the population's needs, to social progress and cultural upsurge, in a word, to justice.

As new technologies are introduced and as society's modernization demands mobilization of intellectual potential and responsibility, how is it possible to resort to solutions like suppression of criticism and human rights at enterprises, of everything that resists the implementation of the schemes by capital's forces? We offer the diametrically opposite solution. It means greater power and responsibility to the workers and citizens themselves, self-management by enterprises, and democratization of all social life.

Finally, it cannot be right to respond to the emergence of the inspiring prospects of a world that is disarming itself, a world of mutual understanding, by investing colossal sums in the production of terrifying weapons or by offering explanations like the one recently uttered by the French defense minister, according to whom France draws strength from its nuclear arsenal. A completely different path ought to be followed—joining the historic process of disarmament and dedicating to life that which is being devoured by the forces of death by building a new economic order.

As you can see, we perceive justice, freedom, and peace as the most modern answer to the problems being encountered by a developed country like ours. It is diametrically opposite to the answers offered by capitalism and presupposes the withering away of that system. These are the characteristic features of the French model of socialism which we developed proceeding from the realities of our own country and the people's customs, needs, and aspirations.

Question. Speaking of pluralism, France is often cited as an example of political pluralism. How does it function within a bourgeois state's framework, and can the PCF take full advantage of it?

Answer. Let us first of all define the meaning of pluralism. The United States, Britain, and the FRG—if we were to limit ourselves to these examples—have several major political parties but not a single one of them intends to change the capitalist nature of the society existing in these countries. France and some other capitalist countries differ in that political life is distinguished by the existence of an influential Communist Party which has set itself the goal of changing society. As well as in that the country's leading trade union association—

the General Labor Confederation—pursues the goal of eliminating man's exploitation of man.

In our country this generates serious dissatisfaction among the forces of capital, which need to gain the consent of a sizeable majority of French people to implement their model of social recession. They are truly obsessed by the idea of weakening our Communist Party and reducing it to the level of a marginal (extremely small numerically and totally unrepresentative—Editorial Office note) tiny group, it being the force around which our people can rally in support of alternative policies. For example, in terms of the votes cast for candidates, the last National Assembly election could have given us 64 seats. But because of the antidemocratic law in force, we gained less than one-half—27 seats—in the lower chamber of parliament. Our positions are systematically distorted or passed over in silence by radio and television, which are controlled by major capitalist companies and the socialist government, and this has forced us to set up a committee for struggle for pluralism and truth on radio and television.

What conclusion can be drawn here? The existence of a multitude of political parties, which are actually turning more and more into a machine for holding elections, does not threaten anything in France. But if we were to talk about respect for political pluralism in the real sense of the word, in other words a free opportunity to choose between current policies and other solutions, this freedom is, alas, under serious threat in our country.

Question. You will soon be visiting the Soviet Union and will meet the CPSU leadership. What are the relations between you?

Answer. Excellent. Simply excellent. And I must say that now they are sharply different from what they were not so long ago, from the mid-seventies to the mid-eighties. For example, we did not have any "summit" meetings for years on end, right until 1980, when we decided to build our relations on a new basis, on the basis of independence, equality, mutual respect, and recognition of existing differences. There were quite a few differences during that period, since the primary issue was the approach to the very concept of socialism.

I first met Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow in 1985. We have met on several occasions since then: In October 1985 in Paris, in May and November 1987 in Moscow, and last July in Paris. I am pleased that we will meet again next Friday, since I personally consider him a friend, and I am convinced that this new visit will enrich the cooperation between our two parties, which is already quite fruitful. Of course, the quality of ties between French and Soviet Communists has been considerably enhanced primarily because we are now agreed in principle on the nature of socialism: A society for man, a democratic and modern society meeting all requirements and needs brought to life by scientific, technical, and cultural progress. This is what we envisage for our own country and it is, in my view, the very essence of perestroyka, which we fully support.

Question. Is perestroyka having an effect on the struggle waged by communist parties in capitalist countries?

Answer. Obviously. Even though every communist party has its own model for the creation of a socialist society, it is obvious that events in the first and mightiest socialist country are exceptionally important for its actual implementation. The period of Stalinism and what you term stagnation had an adverse effect on parties like ours. For a sizeable majority of French people, Soviet socialism during that period became synonymous with violations of human rights, synonymous with gerontocracy and military threat. But despite all our differences, even then we refused to become disillusioned with socialism, although this had serious consequences for us. None of this made our tasks any easier.

On the one hand, perestroyka has done away with many of these problems. Your initiatives in favor of peace and disarmament, the political settlement of regional conflicts, and new-style international cooperation have generated tremendous response among public opinion. The Soviet Union's image has considerably changed for the better. Similarly, there is virtually no criticism of your country as regards human rights violations, and we are extremely pleased with this. All this results in the creation of the best possible conditions for our own actions. Nonetheless, this does not mean that the campaign against the Soviet Union has come to an end in our country. Of course, it is no longer branded as the "Gulag." On the other hand, the mass media are constantly asserting "the obvious failure of socialism..."

Question. It is said that people in the West have now stopped fulminating against us and are praising us more. Including some who are far from sympathetic toward communism. Could we be going wrong somewhere? What do you think?

Answer. You know, those who, as you mildly put it, "are far from sympathetic toward communism" are in no way more sympathetic toward it today. This is precisely because it still remains communism. Capitalist leaders are most carefully following the scope of the changes occurring in your country now. They have launched a really broad ideological offensive whose objective is to give the Soviet Union a repulsive image. And you talk about "praising..."

Look at last week's newspapers. On Monday LE MONDE, which is quite close to those in power, wrote that Mikhail Gorbachev—and I quote—"marked his return from vacation by a mediocre speech." On Tuesday our press wrote that Moscow is "threatening" and "adopting a harsher tone" toward the GDR. On Wednesday it reported that Yeltsin foresees an inevitable civil war which would result in 14-20 million dead in the USSR. This, to put it bluntly, is dubious "praise" and it is to be seen every day.

I have observed that the anti-Soviet campaign in France started building up again following Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in the Sorbonne. One can understand why. He said in that speech: "Perestroyka in the Soviet Union is bringing us back to the undistorted values of socialism—democracy, people's power, social justice, and human rights." To all intents and purposes, this appraisal is aimed against those in the West who, as he put it, nurture the hope that the socialist countries will return to the bosom of capitalism. I entirely support this viewpoint of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. But it is obviously disliked by the supporters of capitalism who would like to instill in people's minds the idea that socialism has collapsed while capitalism has, on the contrary, finally proved its superiority!

Question. A process of changes is under way not only in the USSR but also in other socialist countries. What do you think of this?

Answer. Every country has its own specific features and there is no single "model" to suit them all. Therefore, every people and every party must develop their own specific approaches adapted to their own conditions and traditions and their own potential. It is obvious that the majority of socialist countries are now rising to one and the same challenge: They are striving to improve economic efficiency, to ensure social progress, and to develop participation (by the broad masses—V.B.) in the democratic process. Failing to promptly tackle the solution of these problems in their full volume and scale would mean making their solution more complex. This is why, whenever we see a ruling communist party setting its country's economy the task of satisfying social needs, guaranteeing full employment, and lending impetus in all spheres of society's life to democracy, self-management, and participation in the making of vitally important decisions, we support all this. We realize that the solution of these tasks is no simple matter, but we do believe that this is the correct path.

Italy's Prime Minister Andreotti on Perestroyka

PM2009145089 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 38, 17 Sep 89 p 2

[Undated interview with Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti by Yegor Yakovlev: "Finding Common Ground"]

[Text] Montecatini Terme, near Florence, was the scene of a discussion about the problems of perestroika in the USSR. Taking part were Giulio Andreotti, head of the Italian Cabinet; President Flaminio Piccoli of the Christian-Democratic International; Senator Aminfore Fanfani; "Moscow News" Editor-in-Chief Yegor Yakovlev; Vice-Marshal of the Polish Senate Andrzej Wielowieyski; and Archbishop Kirill of Vyazma and Smolensk.

After the discussion Giulio Andreotti answered MN editor-in-chief's questions:

MN: Your sympathy towards Soviet perestroika is evident. I am familiar with your latest book about the USSR and have closely followed your remarks during today's discussion but there are people holding opposite views. What makes you speak in favour of perestroika, and who are the people strongly disapproving of it?

[Andreotti] There are at least two significant motives for my own attitude. Our ideal is a democratic society which honours human rights. Today your country is pursuing this ideal. Secondly, while the world was on the brink of war, military expenditures were eating up funds that could have been used to benefit the people. This applied to your country and other European countries. Now the situation has changed. I feel these two arguments are strong enough not only to make me hail Soviet perestroika but also to hope for its full realization.

As to those who disapporove of perestroika, I would divide them into two groups. The first take a wait-and-see attitude. The second are so used to confrontation that they feel nostalgia for it. However, I don't think they are numerous. The majority are well disposed towards perestroika.

MN: What do you think about the further course of developments in my country?

[Andreotti] The greatest difficulties are obviously economic. You must try to achieve a rational combination of reform in production with democratization in society. Let me note that it is extremely important to make use of the political experience accumulated in the Soviet Union on the basis of free elections. Moscow's initiatives, specifically in the sphere of the international cooperation of scientists, which I never tire of advocating, can be of great help in avoiding social upheavals. For instance, Gorbachev's respect for religion has established his credibility with believers, including those professing Islam.

MN: The press here writes a lot and quite favourably about Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming state visit to Italy. What can be expected of this visit?

[Adreotti] I hope both sides will achieve useful results. The Italian people will be able to express their appreciation of Gorbachev's policies, while the Soviet leader will get an inkling of the system of political pluralism that has contributed to my country's progress. It is most important that Gorbachev meet with the Pope when he is in Rome. He is the first Slav to hold the office in four centuries. We are very fond of him. The meeting between John Paul II and Gorbachev will be a historic moment for Roman Catholics and their dream of world peace.

TASS Reports Emigration of Pontic Greeks

LD2009204189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0550 GMT 20 Sep 89

[By TASS Correspondent Vladimir Malyshev]

[Text] Athens, 20 Sep (TASS)—Every morning at the central station of the Greek capital you can see a group of people unlike the other passengers. Whole families with cases, bundles, and boxes get out of the Moscow-Athens express. The heaps of baggage piling up on the platform show that they are not tourists, but people coming here to live permanently.

They speak an unusual mixture of Russian and Greek, or rather of Old Greek, which the locals have difficulty in understanding. They are Pontic Greeks: emigrants from Greece living on the territory of the USSR. According to the census of 1979 there are about 344,000 of them in our country, and according to the local press, about 600,000. Recently the emigration of persons of Greek nationality from the Soviet Union has increased noticeably. The paper VIMA reported that in 1987 there were 500 of them, and in the first 7 months alone of this year more than 2,300.

Why are they going? Let's try to put this question to the tired people getting out of the carriage.

"I'm coming at the invitation of relatives," says one of them. "I have an elder brother and an uncle here. We want to live together." "I'm fed up with waiting in line," another says in annoyance. "Perhaps my family will be able to live like human beings here." "We come from Central Asia," answers a third. "It's now gotten very uncomfortable there for people who are not of the indigenous nationality. We were afraid that they might start to slaughter us, as they did the Meskhetian Turks."

According to the staff of the consular section of the USSR Embassy in Greece, the reasons for the emigration do not end of course with these laconic answers. The problems of the Pontic Greeks living in the USSR have roots going far back. In the 30's a glaring injustice was done to them as to the representatives of a number of other nationalities. Thousands of people were exiled from their traditional places of residence to other regions of the USSR. Many were forceably deported to Greece. The wounds from these dramatic events have not yet healed. The worsening of relations between nationalities in the regions where the Greeks are now settled, particularly in Georgia, has also played a role.

What awaits the new, now voluntary immigrants in Greece?

The Greek Government gives all those who come a passport without delay. It is more complicated when it comes to housing and a job...

"In Greece," says Valentina Sarli, president of "Berezka", the society for people hailing from the USSR in Athens, "they have difficulty in finding work, accommodation is very expensive. Immigrants adapt slowly to an alien way of life, but, even so, some cannot get used to it. It is not easy to gain recognition here for diplomas of higher and secondary education from Soviet institutions. This means that it is difficult to find employment in one's field. In general, I think it is not the one who has given birth that is the mother, but the one who has done the bringing up, who has done the educating—the Soviet Union. Therefore, I feel sure that an emigrant is a person who, after leaving his mother, cannot be happy. Language is not the main thing."

"I am one of those Soviet citizens who is Greek," says artist Yuriy Spiropulo, "who found theirselves here not of their own free will, but were expelled in 1937 on Stalin's order. We wept, we did not want to leave, but they forced us to. Quite a few Greeks were resettled in other areas of the USSR and perished in the camps. Many years have passed since that time, it is too late now for me to return. Nevertheless, I will say that for all of them the Soviet Union is and remains their one and only motherland. In my opinion, those who are leaving at the present time are making a big, irremediable mistake. I feel sure that many will regret it."

Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaraguan Defense Minister on Arms Aid Halt

LD1809100989 Moscow TASS in English 0932 GMT 18 Sep 89

[Text] Mexico September 18 TASS—By TASS correspondent Alexey Kravchenko:

A drop in the number of armed clashes in Nicaragua from 3-4,000 to some 400 this year clearly proves that the disbanding of the contras has become irreversible, Nicaraguan Defence Minister Humberto Ortega told reporters after attending independence day celebrations in Mexico.

However, peace will return to Nicaragua only after the complete disbandment of the contras and the holding of democratic elections, he said.

The Sandinista leadership regards the recent Soviet decision to stop supplying arms to Nicaragua as a contribution by the Soviet Union to the settlement of the conflict and to peace in Central America, the minister told TASS.

This move comes amid other efforts by Central American and other countries to stop the war in the region, including work by the Contadora group and the Group of Eight, the Guatemala accords, talks in Sapra in Nicaragua and the recent summit of five presidents of countries in the region in Tela in Honduras.

It was very important that the Soviet leadership's measures won support from other states.

Peace in Central America can only be achieved when not one single bullet, gun, or bomb is delivered from abroad, Ortega said.

'Announcement' on Nicaraguan Delegation's Visit

PM2009101589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

["Joint Soviet-Nicaraguan Announcement on Stay in the USSR of a Delegation from Nicaragua's National Assembly"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] A delegation from the Nicaraguan National Assembly headed by Carlos Nunes Telles, member of the Sandinist National Liberation Front [FSLN] National Leadership and chairman of the National Assembly, was in the Soviet Union on an official visit 10 through 14 September 1989 at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Nicaraguan parliamentarians were received by A.I. Lukyanov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politbureau and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Conversations took place at the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs, and also the Central Electoral Commission for Elections of USSR People's Deputies, the Soviet Peace Fund, and the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Latin American Peoples.

The delegation members laid a wreath at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and at the grave of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin wall.

In addition to Moscow, the delegation visited Leningrad where the Nicaraguan parliamentarians laid a wreath at the Piskarevskoye Memorial Cemetery, visited the V.I. Lenin Memorial Museum in the Smolnyy, and had conversations in the Leningrad City Soviet Executive Committee on the work of the local organs of power.

During the conversations, which took place in a frank and friendly atmosphere, the members of the National Assembly delegation were told in detail about the essence of the present stage of the perestroyka being conducted in the USSR, about the tasks facing the Soviet people in work to implement political and economic reforms, about the recent election campaign to elect of USSR people's deputies, and about the results of the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies and USSR Supreme Soviet session. Particular attention was devoted to questions connected with further development of democratization and glasnost in the Soviet Union on the basis of broad pluralism of opinions and of participation by all strata of Soviet society in solving the state's political, socioeconomic, and cultural problems.

The National Assembly deputies noted that Nicaragua is following with great interest the development of the perestroyka processes in the USSR and supports the course adopted by the Soviet people of renewing all aspects of society's life. For their part, they talked about the internal political situation in their country, the efforts being made to solve the socioeconomic problems facing it, the development of national dialogue among Nicaragua's various political forces, and preparations for the forthcoming general elections in February 1990.

The Soviet side stressed that the USSR welcomes the steps being taken by the FSLN and other political forces in Nicaragua to reach national accord in the country and to hold democratic elections there in the presence of international observers, and wished them success in developing the democratization process for the good of all Nicaraguans.

While discussing the world situation the sides expressed the coinciding opinion that the current international situation is typified by strengthening positive tendencies, a switch from confrontation to cooperation, and the organization and activation of multifaceted contacts among different countries and political and social forces. Parliaments' increasing role in the search for ways to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, secure lasting peace, and strengthen international cooperation was stressed.

The Nicaraguan National Assembly delegation expressed its support for the efforts being made by the Soviet Union for a comprehensive solution to the global problems facing mankind, which arouse the justified concern of all states regardless of their geographic position, the size of their territory, or their political structure. The Soviet and Nicaraguan parliamentarians noted with satisfaction the two countries' coincidence of approaches on questions of ensuring peace and security on earth and stressed the growing need for joint efforts to be made by all states and peoples and all political forces of our time to ensure the survival of civilization, mankind's progress, and the establishment of the new political thinking once and for all in international relations.

The sides stressed that there have been positive changes in the unblocking of a number of acute regional conflicts, which became possible as a result of the political will demonstrated by the sides involved in them for a settlement based on mutually acceptable compromises and a readiness to take into account each other's position. In addition, they expressed the mutual opinion that the preservation of tension in some regions of the world is a major destabilizing factor in international politics posing a threat to peace and security and to the peoples' sovereignty and social progress. The Soviet and Nicaraguan parliamentarians advocated the speediest solution to regional conflicts exclusively by peaceful means, on the basis of strict observance of generally recognized norms of international law, consideration of the legitimate interests of all countries and peoples, and respect for their inherent right to freely choose their own path of development.

In this context significant space was devoted to discussing the present situation in Central America. The sides stressed that, thanks to the efforts made by the Central American states and the wisdom, realism, and readiness to seek a balance of each other's interests

shown by their leadership, important specific accords were reached which mapped out practical ways to solve the crisis in the region.

The Nicaraguan delegation provided information about the steps taken by the country's leadership within the framework of the Guatemalan process. Particular attention was paid to implementing the further democratization of the country's life, expanding the rights of the opposition during the election campaign which has begun and in the use of the mass media, and creating conditions to reintegrate the former contras into peaceful internal political life. The National Assembly deputies stressed Nicaragua's will and determination to fully carry out the obligations facing it which stem from all the accords reached by the presidents of the Central American states on a political settlement in this region of the world.

The Soviet parliamentarians expressed resolute support for Nicaragua's constructive, flexible position, which reflects its genuine interest in establishing lasting peace in Central America. The Soviet Union welcomes positive moves to unblock the regional crisis. For its part it is ready to continue to assist in every possible way the process of a peaceful settlement and calls on all countries outside the region to do likewise.

Both countries' deputies noted that it is particularly important for the Central Americans themselves to settle the conflict by political means by rejecting a strong-arm solution of the crisis, finding mutually acceptable solutions to the existing problems, establishing good-neighborliness and equal cooperation among the region's states, and respecting the choice made by their peoples.

In discussing the problems of the world economy the sides advocated restructuring international economic relations on a fair democratic basis, ensuring international economic security, and developing trade, economic, scientific, and technical ties between states without any discrimination. They stressed the inadmissibility of using financial and economic levers to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign countries and to put political pressure on them. The close interconnection between development and disarmament, which would make it possible to release significant material and human resources and to use them for the good of the socioeconomic progress of all states, and primarily the developing countries, was noted.

The sides confirmed their adherence to the cause of defending human rights and freedoms and creating international legal guarantees of the observance of individual rights and freedoms. They regard the strengthening democratization of the world order as a favorable basis for the genuine establishment of basic civil and political rights and freedoms and respect for human life and dignity as the highest values of civilization.

The Soviet and Nicaraguan parliamentarians expressed serious concern about the exacerbation of the problem of drug addiction and illegal drug trafficking. They resolutely advocated that all members of the world community urgently adopt drastic measures to eradicate this evil.

The sides noted with satisfaction the ever-increasing role of the United Nations in solving the cardinal problems of our time both on a global and on a regional level. The United Nations' active participation in questions of security and disarmament and of organizing political dialogue and constructive cooperation in economic, humanitarian, ecological and other spheres, and the active involvement of this representative international organization in settling regional conflicts, including in Central America, assumes particular significance in current conditions of the world's increasing interconnection and interdependence. In the opinion of both countries' parliamentarians, the search for solutions and settlements of complex international problems becomes more effective if it is bolstered by the prestige of this universal forum of nations which expresses the opinion of the entire world community, its desire to preserve life on earth and ensure civilization's progress.

The members of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Nicaraguan National Assembly deputies expressed mutual satisfaction with the ongoing development of traditionally friendly Soviet-Nicaraguan relations, which are characterized by constructive political dialogue at various levels and multifaceted ties in the trade, economic, scientific, technical, cultural and other spheres, and advocated their consolidation on a mutually advantageous and equal basis. They particularly noted the high level attained in bilateral parliamentary contacts, which help our people's greater mutual understanding and their further friendly rapprochement.

Political & Social

'Major Reshuffle' in Party Bodies Reported

LD2009210489 Moscow TASS in English 2100 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 20 TASS—The two-day meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee ended on Wednesday [20 September] with a major reshuffle in the top party bodies.

Viktor Nikonov, Viktor Chebrikov and Vladimir Shcherbitskiy retired and were relieved of their duties of Politburo members.

Nikonov and Chebrikov were also relieved of the duties of Central Committee secretaries.

Two candidate members of the Politburo, Yuriy Solovyev and Nikolay Talyzin, also retired.

Gorbachev warmly thanked Nikonov, Chebrikov, Shcherbitskiy, Solovyev and Talyzin for their many years of fruitful activity in party bodies.

The plenum elected Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the State Security Committee, full Politburo member.

The plenum promoted Yuriy Maslyukov from candidate to full Politburo membership.

Yevgeniy Primakov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Council of the Union, and Boris Pugo, chairman of the Central Committee's Party Control Committee, were elected candidate Politburo members.

In other organisational changes, Yegor Stroyev, first secretary of the Orel Regional Party Committee, Yuriy Manayenkov, first secretary of the Lipetsk Regional Party Committee, and Gumer Usmanov, first secretary of the Tatar Regional Party Committee, were elected secretaries of the Central Committee.

The plenum promoted Andrey Girenko, first secretary of the Crimean Regional Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, from candidate to full membership of the Central Committee and elected him central committee secretary.

On Wednesday, the plenum continued the discussion of the party's draft platform on the ethnic issue and party leader Mikhail Gorbachev's report on the party's nationalities policy in present-day conditions.

The plenum approved the draft platform, taking into account proposals and amendments made during the discussion, and adopted a resolution on the issue.

It heard a report by Prosecutor General Aleksandr Sukharev, whose office had considered an application from Politburo Member and Central Committee Secretary Yegor Ligachev to the Central Committee and the prosecutor's office concerning accusations of bribery, brought against him by investigators Telman Gdlyan and Nikolay Ivanov.

The prosecutor's office carried out an investigation which proved complete groundlessness of the accusations.

The plenum adopted a resolution on this issue, which will be published in the press.

Gorbachev concluded the plenum with a speech.

Biographies of New Politburo Members Noted

Kryuchkov Elected

LD2109105989 Moscow TASS in English 1025 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—Vladimir Kryuchkov was born in the city of Volgograd in 1924. He is Russian and has been a member of the Communist Party since 1944.

Kryuchkov holds the title of general of the Army.

He graduated from the all-Union correspondence law institute and the higher diplomatic school at the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

He began his career in 1941 as a factory worker. From 1943 onwards he was an organiser of the Young Communist League Central Committee at a construction project, secretary of a district committee and second secretary of the Volgograd city committee of the Communist League.

After graduating from the diplomatic school in 1954, Kryuchkov became third secretary in a Foreign Ministry department and third secretary of the Soviet embassy in Hungary.

From 1959 Kryuchkov served in the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee apparatus: as aide, head of a sector, assistant to a party secretary.

Starting from 1967 he held senior posts at the State Security Committee (KGB). In 1978 he became deputy chairman and in 1988 chairman of the KGB.

Kryuchkov has been a member of the party Central Committee since 1986. He has been awarded with seven soviet orders.

Maslyukov Promoted

LD2109155689 Moscow TASS in English 1436 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—Yuriy Maslyukov, Russian, was born in 1937 in Leninabad, Tajikistan. A CPSU member from 1966. [sentence as received] In 1962 he graduated from the Leningrad Mechanical Institute. After that he worked at a scientific and research institute, first as an engineer and chief engineer, then a

deputy chief of a department and deputy director. From 1970 he worked as the chief engineer of a branch of the Izhevsk engineering plant, head of the main technical department and deputy minister of the defence industry. In 1982 Maslyukov became first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, in 1985 deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, in 1988 first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee.

Maslyukov has been a member of the CPSU Central Committee from 1986. In 1988 he was elected alternate member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee. He was decorated with four Soviet orders.

Biographies of Candidate Politburo Members Reported

Primakov Elected

LD2109152289 Moscow TASS in English 1400 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—Yevgeniy Primakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, was elected at the plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, which ended yesterday, an alternate member of the Politbureau of the party Central Committee.

Primakov, Russian, was born in Kiev in 1929. He graduated from the Moscow Institute of Oriental Studies and a post-graduate course at Moscow State University. He holds a doctor degree in economic science, is an academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences and a state prize laureate.

Primakov worked at the state Committee for Radio Broadcasting and Television in 1956-62, at PRAVDA in 1962-70, then became deputy director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences (IMEMO), director of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences, IMEMO director and member of the presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Primakov joined the party in 1959. In 1986 he became an alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee, in April 1989 a member of the party Central Committee. He is also a people's deputy of the USSR from the party and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Pugo Elected

LD2109155189 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—Boris Pugo was elected an alternate member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee at the party plenary meeting on Wednesday. Pugo is head of the party Control Committee at the CPSU Central Committee.

Boris Pugo, Latvian, was born in 1937 in Kalinin, central Russia. He graduated from the Riga Polytechnical Institute and started working as an engineer at the Riga electric engineering plant in 1960.

From 1961 he has worked at the Young Communist League Organisations of Latvia and the Young Communist League's Central Committee. Pugo joined the party in 1963. In 1974 he was an inspector of the CPSU Central Committee, then head of a department at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, and first secretary of the Riga Party City Committee.

From 1976 Pugo has worked at the State Security Committee of Latvia and was appointed its head in 1980.

In 1984 Pugo was elected secretary of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party. Four years later he was endorsed as chairman of the party Control Committee at the CPSU Central Committee. He is a member of the CPSU Central Committee since 1986. A deputy of the previous USSR Supreme Soviet, he is now a deputy of Latvia's Supreme Soviet.

Gorbachev's Closing Speech at Plenum Broadcast

LD2009210589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1706 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Closing speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on 20 September at the conclusion of CPSU Central Committee Plenum in the Kremlin Palace—recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] I would like to stress yet again the fundamental idea—because now when a program exists, a great deal of work lies ahead for the party—that we cannot count on success in our multinational country if we do not tackle the issues of interethnic relations and the development and improvement of our federation in a thorough manner and every day. In the same way, all the possible problems of the federation will be resolved successfully. Such as the paths toward perestroyka, democratization, glasnost, and the renewal of our socialist society.

Here there is, so to speak, the most organic live bond, and we should take this into account in our practical work. We can see that being slow, the delay in resolving these questions is already starting to have a negative effect on our affairs and on the practical implementation of the policy of perestroyka. At the same time, we should all see, comrades, that what we are counting on can only take place if we not only maintain but also fortify the policy of perestroyka.

We can see all the complexity of the situation in the country. We can see the need to adopt decisive measures in order to normalize the situation where tension exists in interethnic relations, where the normal labor rhythm

has been disrupted, and where a threat has been created to people's lives, we should act resolutely. It seems to me that we all agree on this. But I think—and I will allow myself to dwell on this for a while—that we do not all share the same understanding of the meaning of resoluteness. Sometimes we invest our old approaches in that word resoluteness. To act resolutely means settling accounts with something without even pausing.

Comrades, resoluteness at the stage of perestroyka and precisely this understanding of resoluteness demands tremendous intellectual efforts, intense intellectual efforts and courage to be frank about it, by everyone. That means consistently implementing what we have conceived and not giving way to growing difficulties. At the present time we are at the most crucial stage of perestroyka when the whole of society is being affected and everyone is wondering whether this will lead to something worse. This is particularly so as there are complications and there are real grounds for such thoughts. But one cannot change things radically—in a revolutionary manner and in democratic forms—if we do not consistently progress step by step. To keep that up, not to deviate from it in one direction or another, not to slow down, not to come to a halt—this is the main thing that should be present in those who consider themselves adherents of perestroyka and the renewal of socialist society.

But here I would immediately raise another question. So, from this follows what I said in the report and I think that this is known to everyone.

We understand that in the current situation all questions must be resolved in an atmosphere of democracy, when one must have contact with people and unite them around the party's aims and around resolving practical tasks, so that embarking on another path in interethnic questions is even less permissible, and so that here, too, we have a political approach, organizational work, a new style with reliance on the participation by and the contribution by people, on their being implicated in everything. This is what is most important, comrades, this is what we must master.

We have finally achieved this with difficulty I think, but understanding has emerged among us. It is growing stronger in the Central Committee and in the party. And the party has chosen the road of perestroyka, although this can be neither simple nor painless.

I would like to say once again here in the Party's Central Committee—and the communists and all working people of society must know this—we must, having firmly embarked on the path of perestroyka, follow this road and renew our party in order for it to successfully deal with and strengthen its authority which it gained by proclaiming the policy of perestroyka.

Now we need constructive and unifying work in society. Let's not harbor suspicions, either in the Party's Central Committee, or within the party itself, or in society—after all, this is a socialist society. Today's tasks of the revolutionary renewal of society must be tackled differently. The slogan, "Destroy down to the foundations," is not appropriate for us.

But it is just as inappropriate for us if in moving forward we were to attempt—we would be looking back all the time and would be afraid of this path we have embarked on and the complications and difficulties which have appeared, that this is nearly tantamount to having lost our way.

No, comrades! This is how it has always been and will be in revolutionary changes.

I would like to say why we must not harbor suspicions in this respect, but must air this subject. Because this has emerged to a certain extent.

At this stage we must consolidate the party, the Central Committee, the party, all of society, on the tasks of perestroyka, of the renewal of society, and march forward decisively. We must not give in either to those who would like to go back to the past nor to those who would want us to embark on retreat movements, and inflicting a decisive blow also against those who, instead of proposing policies and serious matters, dish up adventurist platforms.

Let us ensure, but in their great majority, that our society and the party are in the mood to go forward decisively.

This is the task of the Central Committee, and I see that after certain events—discussions in the Central Committee itself—that the current plenum is taking place in a situation of an understanding of its role, its new role, and at the stage of drastic changes in our society. I want to mention this as a very important gain because a great deal depends on the position of the Central Committee, on what is taking place in it, and to a great extent how things will go in the party, how things will go in our society. This is very important.

I think that we've had a frank and direct discussion here—one may agree or disagree with one thing or another. Perhaps in any case some problems have been aired here concerning nationalities policy, interethnic relations, the development of the regions, so that they have seemed to smack of dependence on others. Even in that case, I should accept everything for consideration, all that's been said. In what sense? This has given us an opportunity, on the basis of such an open exchange of opinions and direct formulation of issues in the drawing of general conclusions at the political level, in the work of the governmental and economic bodies, at the level of the republics and regions—to discover that of which we need to rid ourselves. This gives us a possibility of seeing the real picture, of assessing it; and I think this is just the situation at which we have arrived, as far as adopting a party platform on the nationalities issues is concerned which, one really can say without any fear of contradiction, is a new word from the party on questions of nationalities policy, and one which impregnates the

policy of perestroyka in the very important, vitally important and acute area of interethnic relations.

It seems to me—and this is worth underscoring in summing up—that we have reached agreement on the main key issues of the nationalities policy. We have an understanding that we shall be able to solve all the issues, to solve all the problems that have accumulated in interethnic relations, in the framework of the development of our federation. We will do this by making use of all that has already been created and amassed, by giving real content to the sovereignty of the republic, expanding the powers of the autonomous formations, and developing the possibilities and rights of all the country's regions. This is a very important conclusion. We have enriched the concept of self-determination itself, because there are those who, for certain purposes, are exploiting this theme, and who are not giving people a chance to understand what the issue is really about, deflecting them onto the wrong path. We have declared our position honestly, plainly and openly, before the country and the world. This, I think, is a great achievement of this plenum. And it is entirely imbued with concern for all the country's people and nations.

We have come out in favor of unity within the CPSU alongside the development and fulfillment of the federation, and alongside the extension of rights in the republics, while also in favor of filling this federalism and sovereignty of our national formations with real content. But we have at the same time stated how this situation also corresponds to Lenin as well, who was in favor of the federation of the people and of a union of states, but who from the outset completely rejected federalism in the structuring and functioning of the party. I think that this plenum and the preceeding discussion have enriched us. We understand the dialectical connection between this, giving, decentralizing political rights, extending economic rights, and the independence of the republics, regions, and autonomous formations; we nevertheless...

I ask that those, let us say, processes of decentralization which are essential for people, for the efforts of all people to be included, and for the country to be moved along the road towards intensifying the resolution of socioeconomic problems. We are at the same time also including such a mechanism, and even more as a party which would continue its line, uniting all people around the aim of perestroyka. I think that after all the discussions and shades of discussion on this issue, and as far as the party organizations, the Russian federation, and as far as the situation of the communist parties of the republics are concerned, there is nonetheless understanding. I think we will finish discussing everything else at the stage of moving toward the 28th party congress, which I will speak about a little later. So we have given an answer here as well, and clarity. This is how we should act, proceeding from the decisions which we have made here. I think it is important in principle that the plenum—all our people have been waiting for an answer to this question—has stated clearly and distinctly that we are speaking out in favor of the equality of nations and people, and in favor of equality for all people and nationalities wherever they live, wherever they work, and wherever they are.

All this is very important, comrades. In this context, I also think that by adopting a principled stand on what role should be played by the Russian language, we caught and expressed the prevailing sentiment, the dominant sentiment in our society. This party decision will also have, I would say, a stabilizing significance for society, uniting people, and bringing clarity to a very important matter on which, having got going—and having started tackling these problems, but failing to grasp them completely, we sensed what was involved and what the consequences of mistakes could be in this matter.

I think that we have acted properly, comrades, in telling our people honestly that today, when we are embarking on the road of in-depth transformations of the federation itself, in all its parameters, it is very important to do this now and not to get involved in any redrawing of borders, and not to change the forms of national formations now. It is now important for us to fill, on the basis of the decisions being adopted—and following on from that no fewer discussions are probably still to come....[Gorbachev changes thought] But we hope that the platform will help to find proper solutions in society. Nevertheless, I think that by advancing in this way, we are following the proper course, we are making the federation more complete. As I said in the Drafting Commission, let us wait a bit: We have not yet lived in a genuine federation, with all the latter's virtues. I think that then all the worries—or at least the overwhelming majority of them—because life will evidently always throw up problems, but the main problems will be resolved along this road, and all the questions connected with all sorts of redrawings and so on will then disappear by themselves. If we allow ourselves to be drawn into this now, and if someone pushed us down this path, I can tell you straight: We would be burying the platform at the outset and bringing our society to a condition in which there would be no mood for restructuring. But the question was about how, generally, to live. And the fact that the plenum adopted an unambiguous, tough, and clear stand on this does it credit, it seems to me.

So I believe that in comprehensively preparing and now discussing this at the Central Committee plenum, our party has behaved responsibly, comprehending the significance of the issues that we have been dealing with in the last few months and the last few days at the plenum for the destiny of our country, and for all our people. I am convinced comrades, that the new stage, the transfer of political aims to the level of the legislative bodies, will be fruitful. This is because we have come a long way toward understanding this whole package of problems connected with relations between nationalities.

I see the task of party organizations, of the cadres, of our communists, as being firmly to support the positions elaborated in the CPSU platform and to implement it, using the methods which are characteristic of our

party—political methods, ideological means, organizational work, correct cadre policy—using this whole arsenal of methods.

Comrades, I think that now, when we have come to understand that it was necessary for us to adopt at this plenum of the party Central Committee, the decision to advance the date of the congress. This understanding was again dictated by concern to more quickly tackle outstanding questions of the development of the party itself, questions of the renewal of the party, and at the same time to sum up the results of perestroyka and to work out a program of actions for the near future. It all seems to me, and I am even deeply convinced of this, these are all steps in the right direction.

Comrades have said here, and I think that this is correct, that the precongress stage really starts for us as of tomorrow. This includes the forthcoming major decisions which we are to make at the session of the Supreme Soviet and at the Congress of soviets. It includes the preparation for and the holding of elections to local bodies and, of course, it includes the preparation of the whole party; not only at the level of drawing up documents but also the preparation of the party in the sense of mobilizing its forces and its potential in the interests of ensuring that it successfully fulfils the role of political vanguard.

Comrades have written many messages to the Presidium proposing that as we are moving into and entering the precongress period—and that this period is filled with great events, major deeds which we must implement—we should review the decision made earlier by the Politburo with regard to report backs and elections in the party committees in rayon, city, oblast, and kray party committees. I think that this is a correct proposal, comrades, because for us now, everything should be subordinated to our preparation for the congress. Therefore, the politburo comes out in favor of these proposals being supported which the comrades have submitted for discussion by the plenum. This will give us the opportunity to concentrate on all the practical work in order to resolve the economic and political tasks in the country, to prepare the party to hold major political campaigns, and preparations for the next congress.

I think that we should also proceed from the idea that all of this preceding work for the congress should work well for our party, for perestroyka, to consolidate society, to unite all our people—all the forces of perestroyka, to unite our people. I say this confidently because people connect perestroyka with the implementation of their plans, the plans for their lives. With the exception of some people who are setting out some ambitious plans of their own, all people have an interest in seeing perestroyka taking place. What is more, they are expecting from us more constructive work which would produce its fruits quite soon.

That, in my opinion, is how we should act, combining the elaboration of long-term issues which our society must equip at this very crucial stage of perestroyka, and urgently tackling the many immediate problems which touch upon the people's daily life. We must ensure this without fail, comrades.

I would like to hope that this plenum will give a new boost to the activities of party bodies and all communists at this crucial stage when we are preparing for the next party congress. [applause]

Comparison of Gorbachev Speech Opening Party Plenum

PM2009095989

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 20 September 1989 publishes in its Second Edition on page 1 an unattributed report on the speech delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the CPSU Central Committee plenum 19 September 1989. Comparison of the PRAVDA item, entitled "Speech Given by M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum 19 September 1989," with the translation of the Moscow Domestic Russian version, which appeared on pages 40-42 of the 19 September Soviet Union DAILY REPORT under the title 'Gorbachev Opens CPSU Party Plenum 19 Sep,' reveals the following variations:

PRAVDA omits the first six paragraphs and begins with column two, paragraph one on page 40: "As you know...";

Column two, paragraph one, sentence five in PRAVDA reads: "...in this issue is convincing evidence of our people's understanding of the significance of the role played by the..." (deleting interjection, confirming "role");

Page 42, column one, paragraph seven, third sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the Supreme Soviet..." (adding words);

Page 42, column two, paragraph one, fourth sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...trade in order.

In conclusion, I..." (picking up second paragraph and deleting sentence);

Column two, third paragraph, second sentence in PRAVDA reads: "...the Central Comm[illegible]ee.

This is the scale of our work in the precongress period." (deleting words and final sentence).

Comparison of Gorbachev's Nationalities Report

WA2109183089

Moscow TASS in English at 1726 GMT on 19 September transmits the "full text" of M.S. Gorbachev's report on nationalities policy which he delivered to the CPSU Central Committee plenum on 19 September. The TASS English version has been compared with the translation

of the Moscow PRAVDA in Russian rendition of the report, which appeared on pages 31-42 of the 20 September Soviet Union DAILY REPORT under the headline "Text of Gorachev's Plenum Report on Nationalities." The two versions were found to be the same except for the following:

page 41, column one, paragraph ten, only sentence: ...have led to.

Disregarding realities is clearly irresponsible in relation to people.

Why does Switzerland have three state languages? Why does Finland, with just a few per cent of its population Swedes, have Swedish as its second state language? Why is English the state language in India?

This is all because there are relevant requirements common to all ethnic groups there. Historically, it has so happened that the same role in our country is played by the Russian language.

We should only get rid of everything that in the past impeded the development of the languages and cultures of different ethnic groups.

Continuing the examination... (supplying additional passages).

Plenum Adopts Platform on Nationalities Policy

LD2009175289 Moscow TASS in English 1741 GMT 20 Sep 89

["CPSU Central Committee Plenum's Decision on Nationalities Policy"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow September 20 TASS—Having discussed Soviet Communist Party General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev's report and examined the draft CPSU platform "on nationalities policy of the party in the present-day conditions", with account taken of the results of its discussion in the party and among the people, the plenum decides:

1. To adopt the CPSU platform "on nationalities policy of the party in the present-day conditions" and to regard its consistent implementation as the task for all party organisations and for every Communist.

The plenum believes that the platform's ideas and provisions, which met with broad approval in society, respond to the essential requirements of restructuring and can become the political basis for the renovation of the Soviet federation, development of all nation- state entities and solution of other nationalities problems in the interests of all the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

2. The plenum charges the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the union republics, the territory and region party committees with elaborating concrete plans for the activities of party organisations in implementing the ideas laid down in the CPSU platform "on nationalities policy of the party in the present-day conditions".

Discusses Interethnic 'Hot Spots'

LD2009190289 Moscow TASS in English 1837 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 20 TASS—Profound concern over the situation in "hot spots", the areas of the USSR where inter-ethnic problems are particularly acute, was expressed by participants in the plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee that opened in the Soviet capital on Tuesday.

Speakers in the debates on Mikhail Gorbachev's report noted that it is inter-ethnic conflicts that were smouldering for years and consequences of errors and deformations which accumulated over many decades that are the point of the matter.

Perestroyka undoubtedly created new conditions for the manifestation of national awareness that became more acute. But at the same time there are nascent dangerous phenomena that can seriously harm perestroyka.

Speakers at the plenum noted there are no universal recipes for settling inter-ethnic conflicts. Each region has specific features of its own without the awareness of which correct approaches cannot be found.

An acute conflict continues over Nagorno-Karabakh, the autonomous region populated by Armenians and Azerbaijanians.

The introduction of special administration for the territory does not yield the expected results. The reason for this is the unwillingness of the sides to make even the slightest concessions, to agree to a compromise.

Both the Azerbaijanian and the Armenian population is affected by the blockage of transport routes. Chairman of the special administration committee for Nagorno-Karabakh Arkadiy Volskiy speaking at the plenum suggested that tough measures should be taken against extremiss and urged party leades of Azerbaijan and Armenia for negotiations, for the implementation of the agreed-upon programmes, for patience and restraint.

Many speakers expressed the opinion that inter-ethnic conflicts are much more often caused by social and economic problems, rather than historic ones. It was so, for instance, in Uzbekistan's Fergana Valley.

Islam Karimov, first secretary of the Central Committee of Uzbekistan's Communist Party, pointed to such unresolved problems as the growth of unemployment, particularly of the rural population, and an adverse ecological situation. He believes that without a comprehensive programme for the development of production forces of the region, ethnic problems cannot be resolved.

A bundle of problems of a different character formed around Soviet Baltic republics. Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, is of the opinion that processes in that region reflect deep-lying processes of the entire Soviet society, but develop more intensively. There are extreme manifestations of the heightening of national awareness in conditions of democratisation. But such manifestations do not have the backing of broad sections of the population.

Conflict situations in a number of republics resulted not only from the incorect approach to specific problems of inter-ethnic co- existence.

Vitaliy Vorotnikov, president of the Presidium of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet, holds that this is also a consequence of the weakening of social, cultural and ideological mainstays of Soviet society. Therefore solution of nationalities problems is possible only in the mainstream of perestroyka, democratisation, consolidation of the ideological basis of socialism.

In this connection many speakers emphasised that the Communist Party is the main force of the consolidation of nations, and plays the cardinal role in conducting and upgrading the nationalities policy.

Further Reportage on 20 Sep Plenum Proceedings

Day Two Plenum Speakers Listed

PM2109120389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

["Information Report on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] On 20 September, 1989 at the Central Committee Plenum the discussion continued of the draft CPSU platform and of the report "On the Party's National Policy in Modern Conditions" by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The following spoke in the debate: I.A. Karimov, first secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee; G.I. Usmanov, first secretary of the Tatar CPSU Oblast Committee [obkom]; Ya.Ya. Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee; A.I. Volskiy, chairman of the Committee for the Special Administration of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast; M.F. Nenashev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting; N.V. Gellert, machine operator of the Amangeldy state farm in the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic; A.A. Vlasenko, first secretary of the Smolensk CPSU Obkom; M.Yu. Yusupov, first secretary of the Dagestan CPSU Obkom; A.-R.Kh. Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee; K.M. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajikistan Communist Party Central Committee; D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister; Ye.A. Yeliseyev, first secretary of the Kabardino-Balkar CPSU Obkom; B.L. Korsunskiy; first secretary of the Jewish Autonomous Oblast CPSU Obkom, Khabarovsk Kray; V.V. Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs; G.Ch. Shirshin, first secretary of the Tuva CPSU Obkom; and V.M. Mishin, secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions.

V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke for the editorial commission formed at the plenum.

The plenum approved the draft CPSU platform "The Party's National Policy in Modern Conditions" (it will be published), which was amended taking into account proposals and comments received and the discussion held, and adopted a resolution on this question which is being published in the press.

The plenum heard the report of A.Ya. Sukharev, USSR general prosecutor, on the results of the examination of the statement made by Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Prosecutor's Office concerning accusations of bribery made against him by investigators T.Kh. Gdlyan and N.V. Ivanov. The investigation carried out by the USSR Prosecutor's Office had shown the complete groundlessness of these claims.

Ye.K. Ligachev and V.I. Smirnov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke at the plenum. The plenum adopted a resolution on this question. (The speeches and resolution will be published in the press.)

The Central Committee plenum examined an organizational question.

The plenum relieved V.P. Nikonov and V.M. Chebrikov of their duties as members of the Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee in connection with their announcement of their retirement.

The plenum relieved V.V. Shcherbitskiy of his duties as member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo in connection with his announcement of his retirement.

The plenum relieved Yu.F. Solovyev and N.V. Talyzin of their duties as candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo in connection with their retirement.

Comrade M.S. Gorbachev warmly thanked Comrades V.P. Nikonov, V.M. Chebrikov, V.V. Shcherbitskiy, Yu.F. Solovyev, and N.V. Talyzin for their many years of active and fruitful activity in the party organs.

The plenum elected V.A. Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR Committee for State Security, a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

The plenum promoted Yu.D. Maslyukov from candidate to full member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

The plenum elected Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, and B.K. Pugo, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, as candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

The plenum elected Ye.S. Stroyev, first secretary of Orel CPSU Obkom; Yu.A. Manayenkov, first secretary of Lipetsk CPSU Obkom; and G.I. Usmanov, first secretary of the Tatar CPSU Obkom, as secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee.

The plenum promoted A.N. Girenko, first secretary of the Crimean Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, from candidate to full member of the CPSU Central Committee and elected him secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave the concluding address at the plenum.

The CPSU Central Committee plenum ended its work at this point.

Speeches From 20 Sep CPSU Plenum Reported

Bakatin Speaks on Interethnic Crime

LD2009154189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 20 Sep 89

["Excerpt" from speech by Vadim Bakatin, minister of internal affairs, at the CPSU Central Committee plenum in Moscow on 20 September—recorded]

[Text] This year, and during the same period last year, 292 people have been killed in riots among the nationalities in the country. 5,250 people have been injured, and tens of thousands of houses have been burned down and looted. 360,000 Armenians, Azeris, Meshketian Turks, and people of other nationalities have been forced to leave their homes. Every such conflict has its reasons, its own shape, and its perpetrators, including, of course, criminals, those who inspire it—leaders who remain in the shadows—the shadow economy, selfish criminal clans, and so on. But in all these cases, the Ministry of Internal Affairs has in practice only one policy, and it is the same policy: bringing in from outside large military formations, made up of people gathered from all over the country, cadets and students at colleges and schools, and mainly units of the internal troops.

It must be said that over this period 872 workers and troops belonging to the Internal Affairs bodies have been wounded, 12 of them fatally. People are killed in carrying out their duty honorably. The direct killers, direct aggressors, and looters are brought to face criminal charges. I must report here that it was reported to me this morning by the Azerbaijani minister of internal affairs that one of the killers of the two policemen, which was reported in PRAVDA today, has been arrested.

But I must say that these measures are evidently not sufficient. For all the mass disorders and conflicts between nationalities which have occurred over the past 2 years, the USSR Procuracy and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs has instituted 1,138 cases, and so far only 344 people have been put on trial and sentenced by judges. Here the action of the law and order bodies has been very slow.

But, let me repeat, those who have been punished have been primarily the actual killers and aggressors; but the organizers and inspirers, those who directly organize, encourage, and guide them by whipping up nationalism, remain, as I said, practically unpunished. The work is poor here in connection with the article of the Criminal Code [article not specified]. And it seems to me that one of the reasons here is that—perhaps I should ask pardon in advance for saying this—but somehow the relevant committees of the republic Communist parties have little interest in this. To a large extent they bow to the pressure of the exrtremists. And the tactics of the extremist forces are surprisingly similar: first of all to incite people to mass, and then, I mean, through mass demonstrations and strikes, pickets and blockades, and so on, to put pressure on the organs of justice. Now there are attempts to organize the same sort of thing around the court process in Fergana. The inciters of the Tbilisi events have been set free without any grounds. Karabakh activists have been released. And activists of the so-called People's front of Azerbaijan have also been released without any grounds. The leader of KRUNK [Armenian nationalist group], whose bribetaking has been established and proven [word indistinct] and who is already on trial—no longer under investigation now, but on trial—the not unknown Manucharov, is, for the sake of effect, standing as a people's deputy of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet.

How can we talk of the inevitability of punishment? In actual fact we are creating national heroes out of criminals. In actual fact we do not have ideological support for the action of the law and order bodies. If this is support, I do not understand it.

It seems to me that this is happening because the effectiveness of law enforcement measures is low, that we have chosen a fundamentally wrong way to settle conflicts between nationalities. (?There is one and the same principle here) whatever anyone might say: Conflicts are born on the spot. This is obvious. How could it be otherwise? But the center must settle it. This is also a principle. And the heads of the republics here are clearly showing inconsistency and illogicality.

Today at this rostrum, the most popular, the favorite topic has probably been the topic of expanding sovereignty, more rights for the localities, more democratization, more autonomy for the republics, right up to such a difficult and complex issue as financial autonomy. Everyone agrees. This is probably right, but by that logic conflicts between two republics are also up to them to solve on the spot. But no. Here their position does a

U-turn. Right away, a telegram to the center: Send in the troops, and more troops. That is to say, protect our railway immediately [words indistinct] (?if) the Communist Party of Azerbaijan. And the Communist Party of Armenia and the Central Committee really implement their leading role, really enjoy prestige among their people. They must be given the chance to show their internationalism in fact. [applause]

If the members of one and the same party, whose ideology and banner is internationalism in the best sense of the word, cannot agree among themselves, then something is wrong. Here the internal troops—I am deeply convinced—Any troops, will not help, because after all internal troops cannot act against party and Soviet power. We can only help the authorities to fight against some extremist forces or other. I think (?it is a difficult step but) probably we must examine this question, and lay all the responsibility clearly and distinctly on the two republics. [applause]

If they ask for the troops to be withdrawn, the troops must be withdrawn, and this request be satisfied [applause] and then at least there will be no one to blame, and they will realize that there is no one to solve these questions but themselves. They will sit down next to anyone they like—with informal groups, with popular movements, with any democratic, as they say, formations they like, or anti-democratic ones, they will sit down at the talks table, and they will remain sitting there until the question is solved. But at least we shall be guaranteed there will be less incitement on both sides, because they wil be responsible for it.

Comrades, perestroyka teaches us to call things by their names in all cases. This is what we are doing. Unfortunately, it seems to me personally that we are not doing this in relations between nationalities. This quarrel is very subtle and delicate. For this reason we have chosen some sort of principle of balance. But this is not how things are in life. There are always reasons, there are always consequences, in any phenomenon. But as soon as the mass media—although only some of them very recently and very diffidently—have tried to dig up the truth, right away there is a reaction, right away offence is taken, right away excitement, even at this level, among us sitting in this hall, all of us internationalists, all of us members of the Central Committee.

But political analysis is impossible if we do not call things by their proper names. This is probably quite obvious. But this is a policy of equal glasnost; a policy of half-glasnost and balance will bring nothing but disaster; it blurs the situation, it contributes to the increase of negative processes, and plays into the hands of those who are winning time and by this means are gaining, as they say, those positions which they probably should not be allowed to gain.

Azerbaijan's Vezirov on Ethnic Relations

LD2009153889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 20 Sep 89

["Part" of speech by Abdul-Rakhman Khalil Ogly Vezirov, first secretary of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee plenum in the Moscow Kremlin on 20 September—recorded]

[Text] We see the solution of the problem of the Nagorno- Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] only in a constitutional framework, including the creation of conditions for the organizing of elections and the renewal of party activities and local soviet bodies. The republic guarantees to all oblast inhabitants safety and the satisfaction of their the economic, social, and intellectual needs. And of course we are obliged, we must and we shall most certainly make it our business to ensure that the practice which led to this tragedy never returns.

Comrades, I want us to repeat again and again the position of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the [Azerbaijani] republic: The problem of the NKAO is just a part of the enormous tragedy that has taken place between our two peoples. Matters have gone very far. It is this that requires a great deal of hard work from us. It is never too late to set to work and do what's right. The leadership of Azerbaijan has advocated, and continues to advocate, dialogue, cooperation, and mutual understanding, even though we may not succeed in every respect. With this aim in view, we have appealed both to the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Armenia, and to the Central Committee of the CPSU, with the participation of the secretaries of the Central Committee—and we are most grateful for the fruitful participation in this of the secretaries of the Central Committee, Comrade Slyunkov and Comrade Chebrikov—in the meeting between members of the Central Committee Bureaus of the Communist Parties of Azerbaijan and Armenia, at which we were once again offered the concept of interethnic reconciliation.

We thought for several hours—for 8 hours—about how to unravel one knot after another. They say, comrades, that everything has been cancelled out. First, a few days have passed and what has happened? What events? Congress, session and so on? Surely no one can allow himself to repudiate those accords! And steps, by the way, have been taken. Some party raykoms have already set up mixed commissions. The comrades have drawn up a draft declaration which they've sent to us—sent us precisely for consultation. Measures of other kinds are also being taken. We've had meetings with leaders of the mass news media and with the creative intelligentsia, and we will work.

We not only have not cancelled those accords, but we think they are good. But if anyone thinks that now that we've met here in Moscow and come to an agreement, everything will proceed of its own accord, then I think

we're mistaken. This calls for enormous...[changes thought]...any accord is only an accord. It must be followed by an enormous amount of hard work. We responded with all our heart to yesterday's appeal by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the leadership and peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia to not give free rein to passion, to stop, and show wisdom and endurance. We assure the plenum that we will not veer from that path. We will not allow emotion to stifle reason. We call on everyone to dissociate themselves resolutely from the dark forces; to solve the practical issues together, step by step; to unravel the knots of contradiction. It isn't an easy path, but we must travel it together.

Volskiy Urges 'Restraint' in NKAO

LD2009201489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 20 Sep 89

["Excerpt" from speech by Arkadiy Ivanovich Volskiy, chairman of the Nagorno-Kharabakh Special Administrative Committee at the CPSU Central Committee plenum in the Moscow Kremlin on 20 September; from the recorded report of the CPSU Central Committee plenum proceedings on 20 September]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Today, the situation in the region has been sharply exacerbated. The Armenian population of the Karabakh is gripped by a complex of hatred and mistrust in the republic, and Azerbaijan takes up just as inflexible a position by threatening the most grave consequences. And so far, there can be no mention of compromises. The Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] finds itself in essence under a blockade, which affects both the Armenian and the Azerbaijani population. All this in our view requires the adoption immediately of strict legal acts on the impermissibility of blockading railways and highways, and power engineering facilities in any region of the country. Comrades!

The commission of people's deputies, which was set up by the USSR Supreme Soviet, while it was in the oblast, made a thorough investigation of the problems of the NKAO. It elucidated both sides' interests. I would not like—and it would not be correct—today, to anticipate the commission's report. But there is one thing which puts one on one's guard: Without waiting for the conclusions and proposals of the esteemed people's deputies in both Azerbaijan and Armenia, and in Karabakh itself, the atmosphere is becoming exacebated. The objective is simple—to influence the commission's findings.

What else would I like to say? The main thing now is not to teach or to preach to one another—I am addressing the republics and other comrades—but to learn together. Let's all sit down at one table—leaders, representatives of the intelligentsia, deputies, and perhaps even in an informal manner. We must, without fail, be with the people in order to lead them to tranquility. We must not farm it out to careerists or political adventurers. We need, by strength of political influence and authority, to do things in such a way that extremists lose their influence on the people. We must show tolerance, we must show restraint and a thrifty attitude to the gains of perestroyka.

Tajikistan's Makhkamov on Self-Government

LD2009162989 Moscow Domestic Services in Russian 1100 GMT 20 Sep 89

["Excerpt" from speech by Kakhar Makhkamovich Makhkamov, first secretary of the Communist Party of Tajikistan Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee plenum in the Kremlin on 20 September—recorded]

[Text] Another very acute problem is that of equalizing the initial conditions for the republic's transition to the principles of self-government and self-financing. Thus, the expected scale of the involvement in the sphere of the national economy of the fast-growing labor resources of Tajikistan, as of all of Central Asia, is so considerable that the general state program, of which Comrade Karimov has also spoken here, is simply indispensable. And such a program must provide for the local training of skilled cadres for the enterprises which are being newly created. We consider that there may be in the localities differing systems of administration, and their formation must be carried out on the basis of the real conditions of the republic, envisaging at the same time also a greater economic interest of the local soviets in the development of union enterprises. Only in the optimal expansion of the powers of the union republics and of other national territorial formations can we really build strong republics and a strong center.

The CPSU draft platform quite rightly speaks of the restoration of justice with regard to the repressed peoples, but, in our view, distortions in the way the national question has been tackled have been reflected not only in the deportations of whole peoples, mass repressions, and the ignoring of economic interests. Voluntarism and mistakes have also been committed in determining the national territorial borders both of union and of autonomous formations. Naturally, what has been said should not be regarded as a demand for a revision of frontiers. But one cannot evade questions which are posed by life itself or pretend they do not exist. What I have in mind in the present case is the settling of questions to do with meeting more fully the intellectual, linguistic, cultural, and other needs of people living outside their national territorial formations.

Smolensk's Vlasenko on Interethnic Issues

LD2009144989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 20 Sep 89

["Excerpt" from speech by Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Vlasenko, first secretary of the Smolensk obkom, at the CPSU Central Committee plenum in the Kremlin on 20 September—recorded]

[Text] The inhabitants of Smolensk oblast recently took into their family more than 2,000 Meskhetian Turkish refugees from Uzbekistan. Their despair and grief was understood and shared by our people, especially the older generation. Today all their children are attending schools, and the adults have been provided with work and housing. And there has not yet been a single case of any of them being called stranger or immigrant. No one doubts his right as a citizen to take part in the forthcoming elections. This is not just a question of the age-old traditions and compassion of the Russian people, ever ready to extend the hand of fraternal help to those in trouble. The tragedy that has been played out in Fergana has aroused an angry protest by our people against the actions of the nationalists, and raised their social consciousness to an understanding of the historical hopelessness of trying to solve interethnic problems by force and the shedding of blood.

None of the mistakes committed in the past give us the right to discriminate against peoples, large or small. Today there are tens of millions of people in the country who are not living on the land of their ancestors. Even in our oblast, which has been Russian from time immemorial, there are today 50 nationalities. One can imagine what would happen if all the republics were to adopt the methods of the Armenian, Azerbaijani, and Uzbek nationalists, or follow the path of our Lithuanian and Estonian comrades. We cannot and must not recarve the map and instigate a great migration of peoples. Life dictates that we be wiser, give priority to dialogue over confrontation, and find remedies to cure us not only of our old maladies, but of the new ones also.

There has been discussion here, comrades, of the political, economic, legal, and linguistic areas of the restructuring of ethnic relations. Without belittling their importance, I should like to draw attention to the ideological aspect of this problem. In our political lexicon we have the truly great and sacred concept of internationalism. It is on the fraternal mutual aid and mutual assistance of Soviet people that our state has been built and our historic victories won. And the present economic decline has been felt especially keenly as a result of the deterioration of interethnic relations. It is therefore to international education that the work of the party organizations must be subordinated.

Every people in every region of our country has many examples of genuine brotherhood and mutual aid. The workers of our oblast have had them for a long time with Belorussia and the Ukraine, Lithuania and other republics, and with krays and oblasts, too. For more than 15 years, the land-improvers of Lithuania and Smolensk have been working shoulder-to-shoulder in peace and harmony. A student international construction squad drawn from representatives of all the country's Union republics and from the hero cities has been working now for a quarter of a century. Such cooperation is a good school of international education. Many economic problems are being solved, and fraternal links are growing stronger. Strong friendship, as they say, knows no language barriers.

Shirshin, Mishin on Nationalities Problems

LD2009165289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 20 Sep 89

["Excerpts" from speeches by Grigoriy Chooduyevich Shirshin, first secretary of Tuva oblast CPSU committee; and Viktor Maksimovich Mishin, secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, at the CPSU Central Committee plenum in the Kremlin Palace in Moscow on 20 September—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Presenter] The work of the CPSU Central Committee plenum is continuing at present. At the morning and afternoon sessions, 14 people spoke. All-Union radio has acquainted you with fragments of their speeches and now we present for your attention the speeches of another two speakers. The floor is given to Comrade Shirshin, first secretary of the Tuva Oblast CPSU Committee. He noted that thanks to the Leninist nationalities' policy and the fraternal aid of many union republics, Tuva has achevied noticeable successess in the economy, science and culture. Concluding his address, Comrade Shirshin said:

[Begin Shirshin recording] Mikhail Sergeyevich's report clearly talks of the responsibility of communists to strengthen the friendship of our peoples, to affirm mutual trust and respect between them. [passage omitted] [end recording]

[Presenter] Then the floor was given to Comrade Mishin, secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU]. He said in particular:

[Begin Mishin recording] Each of us, apart from everything else, is probably aware, through our own political practice, of the acuteness of problems between the nationalities. I, too, have had occasion to be fully aware of this, working in the committee of special administration of Nagorno-Karabakh. While sharing and supporting the evaluations and conclusions of Mikhail Sergeyvich Gorbachev's report on the whole, and on this specific seat of tension between the nationalities, and also considering what Comrade Volskiy said here about the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh, as a Communist and trade union worker, I would like to share some of my thoughts on ways to overcome the contradictions between the nationalities. [passage omitted]

The conflicts between nationalities have manifested themselves trenchantly in the trade union movement also. In the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, trade unions have turned out to be practically worthless. In Armenia and Azerbaijan they have not been able to withstand the discrimination and the expulsion of people from work and from various centers [ochag]. In Moaldavia and Estonia they have not become real forces

for the consolidation of working people of different nationalities. These questions, along with difficult sociopolitical and economic problems, were the focus of attention of our recent AUCCTU sixth plenum. [passage omitted] [end recording]

[Presenter] The CPSU Central Committee plenum is continuing its work.

Further Reportage on 19 Sep CPSU Plenum Speeches

Arutyunyan Appeals for 'Compromise' on NKAO

LD2009180189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1520 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Speech by Suren Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, at the 19 September CPSU Central Committee Plenum proceedings in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Text] The situation is very serious. We have no right to underestimate it. People are worried about where we are headed. Are the foundations of the union not being eroded? To answer this a profound analysis is needed: What are the causes of what is happening? What can we expect in the next 2 years and in the long-term?

Those who are looking for one cause of exacerbated interethnic relations common to all republics and corresponding universal remedies for resolving conflicts are very much mistaken. Each region has its own specific nature without an understanding of which the correct methods of approach cannot be found.

Both the echo of the past and the realities of the present are affecting the current sociopolitical situation in Armenia. Laying the entire responsibility on the intrigues of extremists would mean greatly simplifying the essence of the matter and depriving oneself of the possibility of finding the correct ways of getting out of the crisis situation.

Armenia is living through a tempestuous time. The increased political activity of the masses, the sluggishness in untying the Karabakh knot, the escalation of tension in relations with Azerbaijan, and the blockade have created an atmosphere in the republic that is close to being critical.

The bleeding wound of Nagorno-Karabakh imparts dramatic tension and acuteness to the situation in the region. I want to stress once more: The issue of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] is not the subject of a territorial dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan; it has not been raised by Armenia but by the people of Nagorno-Karabakh itself. The platform of the CPSU correctly states that the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh must be resolved by a constitutional law, on a democratic basis, openly, with the mandatory participation of the representatives of all the parties concerned. I think that of fundamental importance is the inclusion in this list of the right of a nation to self-determination, without which, as is known, there can be no truly democratic nationalities policy.

The situation must be assessed realistically. In the current situation when mutual distrust, intolerance, and even hostility have accumulated from both sides, one must look for a way out along the paths of compromise. It seems to us that granting Nagorno-Karabakh the status of an autonomous territory under union jurisdiction would be a sensible step in this direction, in other words, the real subordination of NKAO to the center with the restoration of oblast, party, and local Soviet bodies.

Vyalyas Addresses Baltic Situation

LD2009180889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Speech by Vayno Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, at the 19 September CPSU Central Committee Plenum proceedings in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Text] For a number of reasons processes in Soviet Baltic republics have recently become an argument, sometimes in favor of perestroyka and very often against it. What is in fact happening, specifically, in Estonia? Comrades! I will tell you directly: What has been taking place in Estonia has, in many respects, been pre-programmed by the well-known events of 50 years ago. Radical changes in the nationalities policy have also inevitably brought to light radical positions, both nationalist and chauvinist. Regardless of the apparent contrast between them both extremes are surprisingly in solidarity in their conservatism and cruel attacks on the policy of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee. We are convinced that the Estonian Communist Party, leaning on the healthy political core of society, has its own program of action and is able to neutralize extremism, to provide constructive leadership for perestroyka, and to continue in the radical renewal of our life. This happens under one condition, that people understand well that perestroyka started in Moscow, the party started perestroyka, and it can only continue successfully in the localities with support from the party Central Committee.

The Estonian people and I state this with all responsibility, having ardently received perestroyka from the very beginning, having seen in it a real possibility to improve their life and the national rebirth. I would like to say most definitely, and this has been shown by our recent party plenum, that we see our further movement forward only in a close consolidation with the forces of perestroyka acting throughout the whole country. A sovereign Estonia in a renewed federation of Soviet peoples; such is our aim. We share the CPSU Central Committee's concern, expressed in the statement in connection with the Baltic situation, with the actions here of certain separatist forces, with the destablization of the political situation. When we speak of party trust, it would probably have been better if we, the leaders of the Baltic republics, had taken part, to a certain extent, in drawing up the document.

The recent meeting in the CPSU Central Committee between the leaders of the three Baltic republics and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was precisely a constructive and trust-filled meeting. We have found an understanding of our problems and actions and we have heard a just, sometimes severe, well-founded criticism of the mistakes that have been made. The conversation in our party home must always be as comradely and principled as this.

Moldavia's Grossu Says 'Strength Is In Union'

LD2009175989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1527 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Speech by Semen Kuzmich Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, at the 19 September CPSU Central Committee Plenum proceedings in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Text] A radically renewed nationality policy, which corresponds to demands and spirit of our perestroyka, is needed. It seems to us that the CPSU platform, considered at the plenum, is perfectly able to serve as a basis for such a policy. It is only a pity that its drafting dragged on unjustifiably. Our proposals and criticisms regarding the platform have been sent to the CPSU Central Committee and published in materials distributed to the participants in the plenum which has taken place. In drafting them, we have started from the real situation in our republic, from those conditions that have led to an aggravation of interethnic relations in Moldavia. We fully support the concept, expounded in the report, of giving the Russian language the status of universal state language. However the sources and initial reasons for these flareups run significantly deeper. They lie in the consequences of the arbitrary rule and lawlessness of the times of Stalinism, of the deformation of national development in the period of stagnation, in economic difficulties and in other very acute social questions. The serious concern of the republic's party organizations is aroused by the fact that there are all sorts of emissaries from public organizations of the most extreme inclination. They are putting out anti-Soviet and antisocialist slogans and are now calling on people to strike as a curative measure in the conditions of perestroyka, and to overthrow the existing structure. They are brazenly strolling about the whole country, but they are not receiving the necessary support.

Esteemed comrades, the growth of the scale and complications of the transformations that are taking place now, the acuteness of the problems of interethnic relations, obliges us to look more intently at the activities of the CPSU Central Committee as the kernel of our party. Today it is necessary to say that we do not always see the clear line of the Central Committee on many questions and evidence of in-depth study. Sometimes vagueness, and a wait-and-see attitude, are felt in the speeches of the Central Committee leaders. Communists want to see in practice the results of the Central Committee's activity in overcoming negative tendencies towards perestroyka, the working out of the basis of consolidation, not only in interethnic relations but in ensuring the integrity and tenacity of our party's life and its renewal. One can hear now quite a few different proposals for a new organization of socioeconomic relations and the arrangement in general of our state union. Unfortunately, voices are not infrequently heard talking about giving a republic the status of independence, a sovereignty that in essence leads to the disintegration of the union, which would undoubtedly throw all of us back a long way, and would lead to irreplacable material and moral losses. I will say categorically that the Moldavian republican party organization does not support such judgements. It fully agrees with the CPSU platform, in which the main idea of the Soviet federation is expressed in the generally accepted formula: Without a strong union there are no strong republics; without strong republics there is no strong union. That means that our strength is in union and starting from this one should pursue a decisive political, economic and parliamentary struggle.

More 19 Sep CPSU Plenum Speeches Reported

LD2009214989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0645 GMT 20 Sep 89

["Speeches at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Sep (TASS)—Fundamental issues of perestroyka and the life of the party and people were discussed on 19 September at a CPSU Central Committee plenum. Having listened to the speech and report by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, those taking part in the plenum adopted a decision on convening the 28th party congress and embarked upon a discussion of the CPSU's nationalities policy in present conditions.

At the rostrum was R.Kh. Khabibullin, of Bashkir Oblast CPSU Committee first secretary. The CPSU draft platform on the nationalities issue, he said, would be received with sincere interest and approval by Communists and all working people in the republic. The main idea of the document—reviving Lenin's concept of a Soviet federation as a union of free peoples with equal rights—aroused particular satisfaction.

The Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] is a unique multinational region. Chuvash, Mary, Ukrainian, Mordavian, Udmurt, Belorussian, Nenets, Jewish, and Latvian people, representatives of more than 70 nationalities live here in compact groups alongside Bashkirs, Russians, and Tatars. Backed up by rich traditions of internationalism which have developed in the republic, party organizations are striving to work singlemindedly on the harmonization of relations among nationalities. Taking account of the views of the general public, the CPSU oblast committee has drawn up an integrated program to strengthen internationalist and patriotic education. Measures are being taken to eradicate imbalances in the siting of the forces of production

and to even out the level of socioeconomic development of various regions. Schools teaching mother tongues are being revived and a great deal is being done to satisfy nationalities' cultural needs.

We persistently see affirming a sense of national dignity and affirming Soviet pride in people as one of the main tasks. Life is putting forward an increasing number of tasks that cannot be dealt with without further improvement in the Soviet federation. We think that the draft CPSU platform contains no breakthrough from established views, preserving inviolate the hierarchical structure of the national and state structure. They fail to take full account of the profound socioeconomic and cultural developments that have taken place in the autonomous republics. While surpassing the majority of union republics for volume of national income and industrial output per capita, Bashkiriya is nevertheless lagging incomparably behind them in its social development. Among the 73 oblasts, krays, and autonomous republics of the Russian Federation the BASSR comes between 40th and 70th [as received] in terms of these indices.

This injustice has come about because 97 percent of the industrial enterprises come under union or union republican jurisdiction and only 3 percent are under local jurisdiction. It is this 3 percent that provides almost 90 percent of our republic's budget.

Autonomous status creates literally insurmountable barriers to solving national and cultural issues. By way of comparison, Estonia has a population 2 and ½ times smaller than that of Bashkiriya, but 105 journals and other periodicals are published there. We have only 10, and where per capita publication of books is concerned we have 28 times less than our Estonian comrades. Local television in Bashkiriya has permission to broadcast only 3 hours per day, whereas this is many times greater in the union republics. We do not have our own film studio.

The unequal legal status also impinges on the political rights of the autonomous peoples. Bashkiriya, with a population of 4 million is represented in the country's supreme body of state power by far fewer deputies than a number of union republics with a substantially smaller population.

Thus, whichever sphere one takes, be it socioeconomic, political, ideological or cultural, we come up everywhere against the restrictions of the existing structure of the federation. This inevitably gives rise to friction in relations among nationalities and devalues the party's nationalities policy locally.

The working people, those who live in the republic, and party committees in the course of examining the draft platform persistently spoke in favor of the necessity of transforming the Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] into a union republic and to have this provision enshrined in the Constitution. This would represent a powerful momentum for an effective development of production forces and spiritual rebirth of peoples. This is not a new question. As long ago as 1936, when a draft of the USSR Constitution was debated, proposals were voiced concerning the possibility of changing the Bashkir ASSR and the Tatar ASSR into union republics. At that time however, the sole formal impediment was the fact that they did not have external borders. Life has shown how far-fetched this condition was. The working people of Bashkiria have no intention, ever, of leaving the union for anywhere else. They have been living, and continue to live, within a single entity of an amicable family and have always been friendly, and continue to be friendly, with their good neighbors.

We are taking the first steps along the road of establishing a federated, law-governed state, guaranteeing an unfettered and equal development to all nations. The conduct of those who irresponsibly bandy about separatist slogans is difficult to appraise other than as reckless. The economic and cultural ties among republics took decades to emerge. Millions of human destinies have become closely interwoven. It is therefore impossible to tear it all assunder in one fell swoop. This will become a real tragedy, above all for those who would leave our union. This also represents an enormous damage to all the Soviet peoples. The single entity of the national economy complex which has emerged in the USSR is an objective reality. For the sake of future generations we cannot allow it to be dismantled bit by bit and taken away to where various nations live.

The speaker noted further that continued improvement in the relations between nationalities is impossible without radical measures in the system of running the economy and without introducing regional financial autonomy.

Having pointed out that through the fault of the central ministries and departments, and of the local leadership, Bashkiria, having at its disposal inexhaustable natural resources, has, in essence, turned into an appendage supplying raw materials and came to sharply lag behind many in social development, the speaker emphasized: Our working people no longer wish to reconcile themselves with this situation. That is why they so fervently wish to go over to the principles of financial autonomy.

During the preparations for the plenum the problems of relations between nationalities were being actively raised by the mass information media. The press, television and radio extensively debated the CPSU's platform, many materials substantially enriched the theory and the practice of the party with regard to the nationalities question. But, not infrequently, the pages of the press literally submerged in a flow of negative despatches, all our ideological and moral gains being emphasized. The papers, pointed out the speaker, wrote extremely little about the various ties between Soviet republics, about the life and work of international collective, about the experience of party organizations in improving relationsl between nationalities further. Some publications continue to whip up the errors which some people at some point in the past permitted to take place in the questions of the nationalities policy. The authors of such articles

attempt, for the umpteenth time, to blame those in charge of party bodies for all the sins, and to pin insulting labels on them under the pretext of pluralism of views. Distortions of facts are allowed to take place, an incorrect interpretation is put on the state of affairs in relations between nationalities by certain articles.

Recently the Molodaya Gvardiya publishing house has published a book by Romarenko, entitled "On the Trail of the Yeti" ["Po Sledam Snezhnogo Cheloveka"] about the reasons for nationalism in the USSR. His reflections strike one as being categorical. Touching on Bashkiria in particular, he accuses the entire nation of chauvinism. And this from a man who does not even have an elementary notion about our region, who is completely—ignorant of the situation therein and of what vitally interests its single multinational family.

That sort of reasoning is nothing but direct incitement to conflict among nationalities, a desire to sow discord between people.

Nobody is entitled, the speaker continued, to inflame unhealthy passions, which leads to the political destabilization of society. The force of the law must be decisively applied to those who deliberately inflame the situation. This was put very well in M.S. Gorbachev's report. However, it is to be wished that what was said is put into practice in real life and does not remain just words.

A number of publications, both centrally and locally, are literally competing in smearing the Russian people. We emphatically condemn this kind of nationalistic outburst. This is malice aforethought and black ingratitude. Life has never pampered the Russian people. Through all adversity and trials the people have carried on and carefully preserved their best qualities: kindness, selflessness, and industriousness.

The draft platform once again enshrines the unequal position of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] in comparison with the other republics. The report contains specific proposals to improve the administration of the RSFSR, and these will be of considerable benefit.

A complicated and contradictory process is taking place in our Soviet home. It is very important to counter the passions and emotions with reason and impassiveness, principle, and firmness. History has given us a responsible mission: to preserve and strengthen the greatest gain of the revolution—the USSR. It is a lofty patriotic duty for all of us to emerge with honor from the current trials, to determine the optimum ways of developing our multinational homeland further, and to preserve its might and unity.

The floor was given to Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee.

I share the view, he said, that in the entire period of perestroyka we have not had a problem more complicated, more acute, or more significant for our society than the one we are discussing today. The overwhelming majority of communists and working people of Soviet Belorussia are firmly in favor—and the results of discussion of the draft platform for the party's present-day nationalities policy demonstrate this—of renewing our common home and of supplementing its potential with real democratic and humanitarian content.

Every union of peoples is strong and vigorous by virtue of the strength and vigor of the real prospects for the whole, its economic, potential [as received] and moral possibilities, the speaker continued. We therefore link the future of society not only with an increase in national self-awareness but also with the true internationalist unity of all nations and ethnic groups.

In this connection, when defining the strategic tasks of the party's nationalities policy in present conditions and shaping an integrated concept of relations between nationalities, it would be advisable to first work up in more depth matters relating to the attainment of internationalist unity of nations and ethnic groups through realization of their creative potential, the diversity of national originality, and their mutual enrichment.

Second, it is essential to forecast more carefully the possible consequences of not only these or those proposals, but also individual formulations. There is no policy without the skill of forecasting.

In beginning perestroyka, continued the speaker, did we think that in over 4 years we would have such glaring problems in various spheres of public life? On the other hand, to suppose that perestroyka is not a struggle; not a daily surmounting of difficulties; not a road on which mistakes are possible, is sheer illusion. As they say, you have to pay for everything, including renewal. But the price under conditions of deep, thought-out, and thoroughly considered forecasting can be far less. Such a key problem of humanization of federal relations as the mutual delegating of rights and obligations between the union and the republics [as received]. It has received convincing coverage in both the report by M.S. Gorbachev and the draft platform. However, I would also like to express the following judgment too: Can the right of republics to leave the composition of the USSR be of an absolute nature? You see each one of them has obligations to other republics and to the country as a whole. In my view, free withdrawal from the USSR should not hurt the sovereign rights of other republics. It can only be carried out under the condition that it will not entail loss either to it or to the union as a whole.

The treatment of the economic content of self-determination and sovereignty such as the transfer of republics to financial autonomy and self-financing does

not appear to be entirely accurate either. A most important problem here is the right of ownership to land and its depths—forest, water and other natural wealth and resources.

Is there not a certan failure to come to an agreement, an inaccuracy, in the clause of the draft where natural resources are assigned to the republics, while the right to determine All-Union bases for the use of them is assigned to the union? You see, it is not excluded that the center, in the person of ministries and departments, can determine such bases that the rights of the republics will turn into an empty formality.

And with such a clause, thinks the speaker, neither the republics nor the union have that triad of powers of ownership, disposal and usage, which characterizes the right of ownership. The approach to the problem is seen as somewhat different. In a genuinely democratic, law-governed federal state—and this is what we are striving for—such strategic elements as the ownership and disposal of natural resources ought to enter into the sphere of the general competence of both the union and the republics, said the speaker.

At the same time, in his view the USSR Supreme Soviet should unequivocably determine the extent of autonomy of republican ownership vis-a-vis union ownership. In their turn republican supreme soviets will determine the extent of independence of oblast ownership from republican ownership, and the soviets of oblasts will do this with regard to town and rayon ownership.

The speaker called this question a question of principle, because for the humanization of interethnic relations both overcentralism and overregionalism are equally disastrous and dangerous. In Belorussia there are 288 enterprises subordinate to the union. Working at them are 726,000 people, or 58 percent of all people working in industry. But their contribution to the republican budget comes to just 8.5 percent. People say: In such a situation no matter how much you try there will not be more hospitals, enterprises for household items, shops and consumer goods. The union ministries will take away virtually all the income. From this emerge the outbursts of emotions, the temptation to give way to pseudorevolutionary separatist slogans and the searches to find so- called "scapegoats". In the localities, cadres have considerable work to do to avert the red heat of passions, to convince people of the fundamental incorrectness, the erroneous thinking, the starting point of which is the artificial division into "them" at the center, and "us" the locals.

This is why the basis of a model for territorial financial autononmy has been laid with the creation of a mechanism which harmoniously coordinates the interests of working collectives, of all those engaged in the foodstuffs sphere, with the interests of the republic and the country as a whole, the speaker continued.

On a union level, the speaker believes, only the management should be retained of those complexes and sectors that are of determining significance in the functioning of the country's economy as a single whole. These are the fuel and energy complex, metallurgy, the chemical industry, the defence sectors, individual types of transport, the ecology, and so forth.

Speaking of the striving of a number of union departments, to retain other sectors for themselves as well, when a republic makes the transition to financial autonomy, the speaker said that this is nothing more than an attempt at a show of strength by those who can by no means reconcile themselves to the changes in the old orders. Even talk itself, irrespective of what it turned on, about the transition to self-government is accompanied by almost euphoria. How can this be, when the republics and regions were all the time agreeing even small questions with the center, and now they are their own bosses. It won't be long before they get dizzy, will it? There is no need to be afraid, they won't get dizzy from self-government, nothing bad will happen until centrifugal tendencies begin to appear. Naturally one should not overemphasize this danger. But one should not underestimate it either.

The negative experience of a number of countries bears witness to the fact, continued the speaker, that decentralization of the economy, if that process is allowed to proceed of its own accord, may call forth both egocentric and nationalistic behavior. Therefore, in making the transition to self-government, in resolving the numerous issues connected with it, we, he said, are simultaneously taking a number of measures to avert the appearance of egocentrism. It is better to divine negative tendencies, to prevent them than to allow them to grow, and then to eliminate them by incredible efforts as is also being observed in interethnic relations.

Or, let us say, strikes. At the recent plenum of the All-Union Trade Union Council, they were referred to as a strong argument in defense of the interests of the working people. The idea was also expressed about the possibility of this argument being used in the future. We will be frank about it, comrades. Where are we heading when we justify the participation of communists, leaders, and peoples deputies in strikes? What are we encouraging? Is it a responsible attitude toward the matter? Is it a striving for highly productive labor or dependence? Are there many working collectives, rayons, and towns in the country that would not have reasons for dissatisfaction? Today it is impossible to visit the areas that suffered from the Chernobyl accident. People are asking numerous questions: What happened in the regions where the strike took place, where the earthquake occurred, where the floods happened, or where there were explosions at nuclear power stations? Surely it was not us, the inhabitants of the Gomel or Mogilev area that caused these regions to be in such a state? Why were strict penalties not exacted from those who facilitated this? Why has personal responsibility not become the norm in our work? Why is it that increasingly frequently the responsibility is shouldered by the whole of the party or its cadres as a whole? People are

also asking at whose expense benefits have been established for a number of regions.

When injustice like this is encouraged, and the demands are satisfied not of those who suffered because of someone's criminal recklessness and who endure it and maintain restraint and courage, but those who use strong-arm methods, it does not help to unite, but to divide people.

I would particularly like to mention, continued the speaker, the status and the situation of the republican communist parties. The communists of Soviet Belorussia, with the exception of some individuals, the speaker stated, reject the idea of turning the CPSU into a confederation of the parties of the union republics; they are resolutely coming out in favor of its unity as a guarantee of restructuring and national revival. Naturally, each republican party organization can have its own program, but it should be based on the initial principles of the CPSU program, it should ensue from the unified aims of the party and should take into account the republic's special features, the specific nature of its political, national and cultural, socioeconomic and other tasks.

As far as the CPSU Rules are concerned, here, he stated, we are of one mind. For a communist, irrespective of where he lives, to what nationality he belongs, the basic law governing party life should be a unified one. He does not agree with those, said the speaker, who would like to bury the principles of democratic centralism. Its formulation does, of course, require more precise definition and additions, taking into account the new conditions in which the party is operating. To return to the principles of democratic centralism as Lenin understood it will allow the creative, constructive potential of party organization and each communist to be strengthened. It will intensify the quest for nonstandard ways of resolving problems, and this means that it will radically boost the responsibility of cadres for the processes taking place.

In his speech, A.M. Masaliyev, first secretary Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee noted that the plenum is discussing one of the fundamental issues of the vital activity of party and state—a new nationalities policy at a stage that is a turning-point in the development of society. Its significance for a state such as ours is, he said, immense. The fate of perestroyka and the international well-being of our fatherland of many nationalities will depend on what this policy is, what policy we develop, and how we put it into practice.

Touching on the state of relations between nationalities, the orator stressed that it seriously concerns Soviet people. The nationality issue has always been complex, all the more so now that under the influence of various factors it has become aggravated in the extreme and is reaching an impasse in some regions. In this respect the CPSU draft platform and M.S. Gorbachev's report at the plenum are, the orator considers, a good basis for a detailed exchange of opinions and for the development of a party nationalities policy that has been weighed up from every side.

These documents provide clear guidelines for party and Soviet bodies and for public organizations in the implementation of that policy. The platform has received the approval of the public and of broad strata of working people. In the speaker's opinion, when the improvements are taken into account it fully ensures the free and equal development of all peoples in the country, and the strengthening of friendship, trust, and cooperation between them. Of course, if the republics and peoples truly want this, they will meet each other halfway and combine their efforts.

We support the platform's idea about ways for further development and improvement of the Soviet federation, which has essentially proved its viability, the orator continued.

Despite all the blunders and distortions, in the years of Soviet power all the republics and autonomous formations have reached a new level in their development, and are linked together by thousands of bonds. To break these would be to cut into living tissue, as they say. Peoples will only suffer from this. At the same time, it would be expedient to develop and adopt a special law on the USSR and its subjects [subyekty], which would concretize and develop the constitutional norms for national-state construction. The law must reflect the formative principle of the federation, the correlation between the rights of the USSR and union republics, and the legal status of union and autonomous formations. Taking into account the fact that the Soviet federation is founded on the Leninist principles of complete voluntariness and equal rights of republics, and of the preservation of their sovereignty, the following should, the orator considers, be added to the draft program: "The union republics, through their authorized representative and according to the procedure established by the legislation of the union, also participate in the resolution of matters falling within the competence of the union."

The speaker emphasized the need to take into account the indifference which has occurred regarding national individuality, and the unsolved nature of many social problems which are painfully reflected in national self-awareness and which engender a sense of offense. Specific facts from Kirghizia's life were cited as an example: the prevalence of raw material and extraction industries in the national economic complex, and the export of products at comparatively low prices. As a result the republic fails to receive a considerable proportion of its income, which in turn has a negative effect on the population's standard of living. When the final work is being done on the draft platform, the orator said, such matters must be taken into account and measures must be stiuplated to eliminate disproportions in the structure of the economies of regions. Distortions in specialization have led to a lag in the standard of development of the working class and of qualified personnel, above all from

the indigenous nationality. This is an indication of the social maturity of a nation. In the working class, the proportion of the indigenous population in industry is 27 percent, whereas in agriculture it is 75 percent, and certain differences exist in the everyday living and working conditions of working people. However, we will not be able to resolve this complex task without the participation of the relevant union bodies.

It was stressed in the speech that it cannot be considered normal when enterprises of union subordination, producing more than 36 percent of the total volume of industrial production contributed to the republican budget only 3.7 percent of the total deductions made to the departmental kitties. Because of this there is a shortage of housing, of children's preschool institutions, of general schools. There is a low level of medical and communal services and citizens are dissatisfied with the activity of central and local bodies. This problem is directly connected with the employment of the able-bodied population. It would be possible to draw more than 100,000 people, who are not working anywhere, into public production today.

The working people of Kirghizia, the speaker continued, are following with concern and pain the development of events in the republics of the Soviet Baltic, which was said with anxiety and from a principled stand in the CPSU Central Committee statement. Tension remains in several other regions. Many activists of people's fronts and movements have adopted unseemly positions. He said that in this connection the time has come to express a clear and firm opinion about such formations and unions, and to call to order those who are already coming out openly against our system and our unity and who are sabotaging perestroyka and abusing democracy.

The speaker emphasized that it is not normal that certain USSR people's deputies, representatives of the intelligentsia, frequently play the role of soloists within these associations. Calls to transform the CPSU into a union of independent parties, to have a multi-party system and to weaken the party discipline cannot but give rise to alarm. All these are extremely dangerous and destructive tendencies and they should be given a decisive rebuff both in the center and in the provinces. On behalf of the Communists of the republic, the first secretary of the Kirghizian Communist Party Central Committee supported the tenet of the platform which states tha the CPSU is and will continue to be international in its composition, ideologically and organizationally united, built upon the Leninist principles of democratic centralism, and that it has a common program and rules.

The speaker also touched on the problems of the activities of the press. In his view it does quite a lot in helping to solve complex issues. At the same time, certain mass information media, instead of carrying out honest and active organizational and propaganda work for the benefit of socialism, in a number of instances direct the edge of their output toward discrediting it.

They allow a great deal of confusion to affect their coverage of the problems of relations between nationalities, casting suspicion on an entire peoples. But, after all, every reckless accusation of any peoples does an irreparable damage to the common cause. The press, this mighty weapon of the party, is working in a one-sided manner. Recently it has indeed ceased to focus attention on patriotic, internationalist upbringing of the young people, on the love of the motherland, on respect toward the older generation. Extremely little is being written about production frontrankers, simple toilers, specialist innovators, communists, and positive changes in the regions.

There are some who attempt to make use of the process of democratization and openness to make our political system disintegrate, as an opportunity to remove the party from power. Individual people in charge of the mass information media play into their hands making the pages of newspapers, magazines and the screen available to launch attacks on all who disagree and to defame the party and the apparatus. It is altogether impermissible when certain representatives of the intelligentsia approve and support meetings and strikes, forecast an impending "disaster" and threaten a crisis, a revolution from below, shouting about saving perestroyka and calling even capitalist countries to help. Themselves they practically do nothing to rectify the situation in the economy, social sphere, consumer markets. Their goals are clear to us. What they want above all is to undermine the foundations of the Soviet system.

In these conditions we all have a duty, along with the development of democracy, to strengthen in every way the party, state and civic discipline, to enhance the responsibility of the cadres, to show wisdom and at the same time efficiency in our approaches. It is essential to strive to attain such a situation in which words are not at variance with deeds, while our economic and political reforms begin to yield results more quickly.

Yu.N. Yelchenko, secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee, who then spoke, stressed: The situation urgently demands that the plenum draw up general guidelines for the practical solution of topical issues of the development of the Soviet nations and for strengthening the USSR as a single, multinational state. Conflicts between nationalities and machinations by frankly nationalistic and anti-Soviet forces in a number of regions of the country have today already led to dangerous social tension and serious political and economic losses. Not only are they not abating, they are continuing to spread and taking on various forms—from strikes to actual armed clashes.

The future of our common home, the Soviet Union, our federation, for which V.I. Lenin fought so persistently, has been put under threat. We are not yielding to confusion and panic. Defending socialist ideals and strengthening friendship among peoples have become the paramount concern of party organizations, and they

are increasingly decisively rebuffing the national-careerists and the antisocialist forces. People are beginning to see more clearly the true aims of the extremists and to understand what abyss they are being pushed toward. The consolidation [konsolidatsiya] of healthy forces is, without doubt, being facilitated by the assessments contained in the CPSU Central Comittee statement "On the Situation in the Soviet Baltic Republics" and in M.S. Gorbachev's conversation with their leaders. Party committees, Communists and the working people of our republic support the stance of the CPSU Central Committee.

The speaker referred to the experience of the first years of the revolution. It is important, he said, that nationalism be called nationalism, chauvinism chauvinism and counterrevolution—counterrevolution. And that this is done in principled fashion, with no provisos.

In our republic in the past few months the volume of industrial output has fallen, and there has been no substantial progress toward satisfying the vital needs and requirements of people. At the report and election party meetings which are being held the Communists and working people are sharply and justly critical of republican and union bodies for administrative errors and their inability to change the state of affairs. One cannot fail to agree with that formulation of the issue. Still, for your information, I would like to report to the plenum that this year a good harvest has been gathered in in the Ukraine, which will make it possible to improve the situation in the agrarian sector of the economy, and this means—and I would like to stress this particularly—to increase the food stocks of the republic and of our entire country. New methods of economic management are starting to function, albeit slowly. Cadres are learning socialist enterprise.

One of the most important signs of the unfolding of restructuring processes in the republic has been a mighty increase in national self-awareness. The problem of the state and legal status of the republic, first and foremost ensuring its sovereignty, is at the center of attention.

As has been noted, the strategic thrust of the party's nationalities policy is an organic combination of national and international interests and values. Hence the practical task of defining extremely precisely the competence of the union and the republics. In the view of the speaker, the proposals about the competence of the union are correct.

They are in the interest of our multinational state and its position in the world. In connection with this, the very high level of responsibility of all republics for the strict observation of our common duties, connected with the defense ability of the state, the assurance of peaceful labor of Soviet people, must be noted once more.

Concerning the competence of union republics, that has to be scrupulously thought out. It is necessary to remove inaccuracies which are contained in the present USSR Constitution.

Of course, the crux of the matter is in the renewal of the Leninist principle of national self-determination. It has to be be defined quite clearly that our union is a voluntary community of people who have also undertaken voluntary duties to strengthen all the time this community. This is why we need, as an organic part of the USSR Constitution, a new declaration about the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic, which has to substantiate the all-round essence of our federation, on the basis of which, for its part the unity of our multinational socialist family must lie.

Speaking about the economic sovereignty of a republic, the speaker noted that justified hopes are being pinned to the implementation of regional financial autonomy. It is necessary to adopt such a concept of it that would ensure the fulfillment of our common, key task: the improvement of the economy of the whole country, which would strengthen its one national economic complex. Now, it is not enough only to admit the fatal character of the heritage left to us by one-sided industrial or agricultural development of regions. There is a need for radical, structural changes in the economy; there is a need for new scale and speed of this work in the people's interest.

Complex and contradictory conflicts have developed around questions of national-cultural needs and interests, the preservation of every people's originality. It is very much right that namely in this sphere maximum widening of the union republics rights is envisioned. This will make is possible to solve many problems that with time assume a very acute character. I am speaking about setting-up and changing establishments of culture and art, educational establishments, defining the status of national language, and changing the network and structure of mass media, and so on.

Of course, here one must act with as much consideration as possible, as sensibly as possible; not at all closing one's eyes to manifestation of nationalist narrow-mindedness and arrogance. Let us take language as an example. While supporting the idea of official status for a national language in the republics, we uncompromisingly advocate the further development of the Russian language—the language of communication among the nations—which has become in its essence a language universal for the state. To ensure the legal and factual equality of the Ukrainian and Russian languages and also other nationalities' languages, whose representatives live in a republic, the examination of a draft law on languages in the Ukrainian SSR that reflects this principle provision—published in early September of this year—shows that the intelligentsia, working people, collective farmers, representatives and all nations and ethnic groups fully support it.

There is a separate question of those nationalities who live as solid groups in the republic: Bulgarians, Hungarians, Greeks, Jews, Moldavians, Poles and Gagauzians. The proposed ways for the satisfaction of their national-cultural needs and requests are on the whole correct. In

the history of the Soviet Ukraine there have been national regions and rural, settlement councils and 150 villages in which majority of citizens are of one or other nationality from the mentioned nationalities.

Taking into account the historic experience and the present conditions we in our republic are working out proposals on the setting-up of national-administration establishments. Thus, it is important to envisage representation of such establishments not only in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, but I think, that this also concerns other union republics.

In the composition of the local soviets of people's deputies on whose territory a multinational population resides side by side, naturally subdivisions should take shape—it does not matter what they are called—to deal with interethnic issues, just as is the case in the executive bodies of these soviets.

In all our soviets it is envisioned that the full representation of citizens of all the nationalities residing in the respective territory should be ensured. For us the most acute problem at the present time is that of the Crimean Tatars. We are at present working on the socioeconomic aspects of this problem, and they are extremely complicated.

The issue should specially be singled out of the spontaneous movements in which national interests are frequently brought to the fore. In the majority of them this is a progressive phenomenon promoting restructuring. But there is another side to the coin. A number of the spontaneous formations have a clearly antisocialist platform, at the basis of which bourgeois nationalism frequently lies.

We, said the speaker, support the thesis about the expansion and strengthening of the independence of the republican communist parties. At the same time, firmly adhering to the Leninist principle of democratic centralism, we believe that the demarcation of communists according to national indices would represent a serious danger to the whole party. The party was pushed onto that path back during the lifetime of Vladimir Ilich Lenin. And we know how Lenin tried to vindicate the internationalist unity of the party ranks.

N.A. Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee, was called upon to speak. He dwelt upon the immediate measures, in his view, for renewal of the federation. He said in particular: Millions of hectares have been taken out of economic circulation in Kazakhstan by military departments alone. Full scale trials of nuclear weapons have been conducted on our territory for 40 years already. Demands by the public for their cessation have been ignored. The consequences which the intensive quarrying of uranium entails are not known to the population. Of course, all of this is necessary to protect the interests of the country as a whole, but this necessity should be explained to the people and the losses connected with it should be compensated. However, nothing of the sort is being done. The lack of ceremony with which tough decisions are being taken cannot help but wound the national sentiments of the people. In a word, we need a law on land and the use of land as we need air.

Why, the orator continued, should the right of the union republics in the CPSU platform of possession and command over their own land, its minerals, timber and water and other resources, not be supplemented by the right to use all of these riches. Without such a decisive right a republic's sovereignty is no more than a declaration. For Kazakhstan—a very major region for raw materials—this is an issue of principle. The reproach expressed in the CPSU platform addressed to local bodies that they, as it wee, are themselves at fault for the imbalance in their economies, arouses perplexity. I will not speak for others, but this harsh course for the priority development of quarrying branches has always been thrust on Kazakhstan by the center.

Speaking about the problems of the federation, N.A. Nazarbayev said that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is an indivisble political organism in whose integrity lies the guarantee of the strength of our multinational socialist state.

The speaker went on to focus attention on the problem of national languages, stressing, among other things: we, the participants in perestroyka, cannot fail to understand the passionate desire of the peoples to save their language to the most extreme limits, beyond which lies nonexistence. As stated in the report, people can see such a true protection in a radical measure—the consolidation by legislation of state status for the national languages. But, while proclaiming the state language of a people which has given its name to a republic, it is necessary, in the same legislative way, to guarantee, too, the free development of the languages of all the other peoples who inhabit its territory.

Taking into account the fact that the USSR Constitution is going to come under review, it follows that in the new edition the Russian language must be declared the language of interethnic contact between the peoples of the Soviet state.

At the rostrum is Yu. S. Karabasov, secretary of the Moscow city party committee. We can all feel the social tension in society, he said; in many spheres of life contradictions have become more acute than ever before.

The struggle of opinions on the question of the fate of our homeland is clearly going beyond the limits of socialist pluralism, from the sphere of ideas into the sphere of real policy. In this connection, what is very alarming is the growth of nationalist sentiments, confederationist tendencies, tendencies toward national exclusivity and territorial aloofness. Attempts are being made to split the party too into national compartments. That is why, in the opinion of the Moscow Communists, the well-thought-out CPSU platform and the number of sobering tenets in the report are a good basis to stabilize

and develop interethnic relations in our country. It is, of course, important that these proposals should be implemented consistently.

Unfortunately, the implementation of what has been planned is still the weakest spot in our work. This is confirmed by a study of public opinion, in particular among the workers and inhabitants of Moscow. They note the indecisiveness and inconsistency of the political leadership of perestroyka, the absence of the proper reaction to the erosion of socialist values and ideals. The point is that the Communist Party shoud operate as an active integrating force, a guarantor ensuring the unity of our union. A large proportion of the speech was devoted to the development of Moscow. The speaker spoke of the need to adopt a law on the status of Moscow as the capital of the USSR and of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. It could regulate the relations between Moscow as a major national economic and cultural complex and the republics and regions on a healthy legal and economic basis.

The floor is given to Yu. N. Prokopyev, first secretary of the Yakutia party oblast committee. The answer to many questions, he said, is contained in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report at today's plenum of the party's Central Committee, and in the draft platform of the party which is being examined. They analyze objective and subjective causes of the accumulated contradictions and difficulties in the solution of the nationalities questions. A strategy of the further work on consolidation of the society and harmonizing of internationalities relations from the position of perestroyka has been founded.

The CPSU platform has made a serious step forward toward the interpretation of problems and drawing of a realistic nationality policy in present conditions. At the same time, in the draft platform not all the ripe questions are enveloped and exposed in the same extent and in the same depth. If it speaks convincingly about the rights and duties of union republics, it speaks sufficiently clearly about the widening of the rights of nationalities of the North Siberia and the Far East and other nationalities small in numbers, then we cannot say this regarding autonomous formations.

In the draft, in my opinion, the speaker noted, the present problems of federalization and national autonomies are sufficiently deeply exposed, but there is not a scientifically based criterion for the definition of union and autonomous republic, there is no interpretation of the dialectics of their development in the given state and in projection.

Many autonomous republics have outgrown the concept of autonomy in which they have been created, and are solving not only local and national questions but, equally with union republics, all-union tasks and are playing a considerable role in the all-union division of labor.

There is a notion that there are no principal obstacles to raise the question about changing the autonomous republics into union. However, in the given stage, taking into account the political situation and the state of the economy of the country, in our opinion, more expedient is the question about such widening of rights of autonomies, when they would have a real right to be the boss on its territory, in other words, it is necessary to bring the rights of autonomous republics as much as possible in line with the rights of union republics.

No doubt, one of the most important question at the same time, Yu. N. Prokopyev underlined, is the ownership and disposal of land, of its bowels, and natural resources. This is especially necessary for republics where all this represents the fundamental source of wealth today and for long time to come. And the Yakut Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic is namely one such republic.

He has supported the proposal that a union republic must have the right of ownership and command of lands, their bowels. But for the realistic widening of rights of autonomous republic, especially those with raw materials, in his opinion, it is necessary to go further, to give the right to union republics,—this concerns above all the Russian Federation,—to delegate on fixed conditions and for a fixed period, the right of ownership and command of lands and their bowels to some autonomous republic. In this case union and union-republican ministries and departments have to built their relations with autonomous republics on the use of lands and their bowels, natural resources, on contractual and lease-out basis, with corresponding deductions to the budget of the autonomous republic. Higher organs of power of autonomous republic must have the right not only to appeal against acts of organs of management of the USSR and of union republic, as it is stated in the draft platform, but they have to have the right to halt actions of union and union-republican ministries and departments, and must have the right to appeal (without halting) against acts of the Council of Ministers of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic and union republic if they contradict the Constitution of the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, the interests of protection of nature, and other vital interests of autonomous republic. In the present time, the Yakut Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic is drawing up a concept, and making basic economic calculations, for the transition to self-management and self-financing.

Yakutia occupies one of the last places in the country in the main indices for the standard of living both of the town and the rural population. Such a situation can be explained by the one-sided structure of the republic's economy that has taken shape, by the hypertrophied development of the mining, in particular diamond and gold mining industries, as well as by the fact that a considerable part of the national income produced tends to remain beyond the bounds of the republic.

We believe, stated the speaker, that the following measures must be implemented among other things. In particular, part of the tax from the turnover received beyond the bounds of the Yakut Autonomous Soviet

Socialist Republic should be handed over to the republic, not only from the marketing of furs, but from the items of jewellery made of Yakut diamonds and gold. The republic should also be given part of the profits that arise from the marketing and utilization of products produced from the raw materials mined in the republic and not subjected to tax from the turnover; the republic should be permitted to market the products obtained over and above state orders, at contract prices on the home and foreign markets, oil and coal in particular.

In Yakutia today, the speaker noted, the question is insistently being posed of the recognition both of the Yakut and Russian languages as state languages. A law must be passed on the languages of the peoples of the USSR in which the freedom of development of all languages, their equality of rights and the voluntary study of them are fixed in law, said the speaker.

There was a time when any manifestation of national self-awareness was quite frequently taken as nationalism. The objective growth of national self-awareness is a progressive process. At the same time, there is a danger that this growth may be accompanied by manifestations of national arrogance and conceit and an acute exacerbation of national feelings. As a rule, this shows itself at the level of day-to-day awareness, especially among young people, which was the case just over 3 years ago in the city of Yakutsk, to which the secretariat of the party Central Committee reacted urgently by its decision "On Certain Negative Phenomena Among Young People of the City of Yakutsk."

The decision was aimed at further improving the interethnic education of the working people of the republic. This task has always faced, is being and will be faced by the oblast party organization. The party obkom worked out a program of action and a system of measures which are being implemented and which have led to certain positive changes. At the same time, Yu.N. Prokopyev said in conclusion, the communists of the republic and its multinational population have more than once posed, and are still posing, the question of the fairness of the appraisals of past events in which a small group of people, mainly minors, participated. Neither the working people, nor communists, nor the intelligentsia, nor veterans took part in these events. These events do not reflect the moral-political situation in the republic as a whole, the native population of which has been historically linked by bonds of friendship with the Russian people over more than three and a half centuries. Unfortunately, a not very correct assessment of this, particularly in the light of subsequent events in a number of regions of the country, was heard in the reports at the February (1988) plenum of the party Central Committee and at the 20th VLKSM [All-Union Komsomol] congress in which these events were presented as though they occurred throughout Yakutiya. Subsequently, in many publications of central periodicals on the subject of interethnic relations, this assessment began to appear, enducing feelings of protest among the majority of the inhabitants of Yakutiya who know what really happened.

The author went on to cite examples of what was, in his view, an erroneous interpretation of the events in Yakutsk in the pages of certain central publications. He requested the party Central Committee to return to an appraisal of what happened in the city of Yakutsk in 1986. This would serve the cause of harmonization of interethnic relations.

The floor is given to R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Perestroyka has created quite new conditions for the manifestation of an increased national self-awareness, said the speaker. This has been made possible by the new political course of the CPSU. All this can only be welcomed but we cannot close our eyes to the fact that together with the growth of self-awareness, we have encountered tendencies and phenomena which are dangerous to the destinies of the peoples and threaten to split society, shake the foundations of the state, and cause irreparable damage to perestroyka.

R.N. Nishanov proposed speeding up work on proposals to introduce changes to a number of articles of the criminal law, providing for inevitable punishment for the commission of crimes from ethnic motives. He invited the law enforcement bodies to radically improve their practice in applying existing laws to criminals, and make it tougher.

It is evidently correct that the Central Committee plenum should require of the party organs and all leading cadres a raising of their responsibility for the events that are occurring on an interethnic basis. I, for example, do not exonerate myself from moral responsibility for the events in Fergana. That has been a serious lesson, the speaker said.

R.N. Nishanov noted that the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Soviet of Nationalities in particular see it as their task to translate political guidelines into the language of legislative acts, and to strengthen and develop the legal foundations of the regulation of ethnic relations. It is necessary to seriously set about fully implementing Lenin's idea of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a federation of equal and sovereign nations and nationalities. This is above all a question of creating a juridical mechanism to protect the sovereign rights of the republics and of any national formations of our great homeland. The USSR is not, of course, a frozen model of a state system, and it is necessary to tackle the problems of perfecting it. At the same time, however, I want to say plainly that to aim at breaking up the established state system and, say, turn our federation into a confederation or indulge in recarving borders, as some comrades are suggesting, is something we cannot do. That would be to undermine the foundations of our union, our historic mutual links, our unity.

He supported proposals to set up an association of ethnic groups of the North, Siberia and the Far East, and also a state body under the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, as well as under the USSR Council of Ministers, which would concern themselves with the development of the national republics, oblasts, okrugs and rayons and with the examination of interethnic relations as a whole. Perfecting our federation, the speaker said, will require altering the USSR Constitution and of the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics, passing new laws and taking special [neordinaryy] decisions. That work has begun, and of course one would wish that it were being carried out more vigorously. It is necessary to pass an official legislative act on the full political rehabilitation of all peoples which have been groundlessly repressed, said R.N. Nishanov. It would be good if Mikhail Sergeyev Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman, were to introduce a proposal on this issue at the second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Here we need a clear political line. We also need, I consider, a state program for the special purpose of gradually, as the conditions are created, returning those who desire it to their native places without infringing the interests of the people at present living there.

The discussions of M.S. Gorbachev's report were continued at the evening sitting of the CPSU Central Committee plenum on 19 September. V.G. Afanasyev, editor-in-chief of the PRAVDA newspaper dwelt on issues connected with the upcoming USSR Congress of People's Deputies. I think that the date for the congress was chosen successfully if only because during the course of many decades this will perhaps be the first congress which will precede the 5-year plan, he said.

Two campaigns will precede the congress—the elections to party bodies and the elections to the Supreme Soviets of the national republics and to the local soviets. In my opinion there is some anxiety, there is some confusion and there is some fear on the eve of these elections, the speaker continued.

What needs to be done for the elections to proceed successfully? First of all, those specific problems which worry people in the localities need to be resolved as energetically as possible and as many of them as possible, he said. We need to prepare for the elections, fully armed. The main thing here, it seems to me, is to work with the masses and to work in the masses, not excluding the informal groups either. If we can win these ideological battles and discussions then we can count on success.

We sometimes make concessions to our opponents and our ideological adversaries, the speaker continued. One concession leads to another, sometimes one of principle. We, for example, clearly do not know—I think that the congress must answer these questions clearly and determinately—who we are, what our system is, where we live? What do we live on? What are our ideals? Where are we going? The congress must give us a program for 5 years, a realistic program, a fighting program, an optimistic program, if you wish so that distinct, realistic prospects appear for our people, communists and our workers.

We must, the speaker continued further, also take into account the opinion and mood of our communist friends abroad. Because they judge our deeds not only by our official declarations, but also by the various organs of the press which are disseminated throughtout the world.

V.I. Vorotnikov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and RSFSR Supreme Soviet presidium chairman said that today, now that perestroyka is going through a phase, probably of the most serious trials, and now that attacks against it are growing on the right and on the left, the task in hand is to defend it as the only true path of the development of Soviet society. The decisive reasons for perestroyka standing still lies in the fact, in our opinion, that despite the broad politicization of the masses, the constructive activity and socialist consciousness of the people, and it may be said also of communists, has not yet reached the level necessary for genuine revolutionary changes. We see that the economic reform and the new methods of running things are not bringing the expected results.

We, having correctly embarked upon the path of democratization and glasnost, have in some things obviously idealized these processes. We have not attached the necessary significance to that circumstance that along with the healthy forces predominating in society, those who essentially oppose perestroyka have exploited democracy for their own aims. This concerns economic, national, and political problems, he continued.

Another series of our weaknesses is, in my opinion, the serious shortcomings in concrete organizational work in the key thrusts of perestroyka. We, I think, often lag behind in analyzing the situation, in the evaluation of events, and even in the preparation of the relevant decisions. Or vice versa, we hurry, act impulsively, without thinking through our actions, so to speak, a few steps ahead.

The speaker said, we obviously lack the forces for a simultaneous attack in all directions. Perhaps it is worthwhile thinking about concentrating efforts on the priority, decisive and front-rank sections of perestroyka. This concerns, in particular, the transferral of a part of functions from party bodies to the soviets. This process has been unjustifiably protracted, the speaker said.

V.I. Vorotnikov noted that the conflict situations which are taking place and have taken place in a number of union republics, including in the Russian Federation, too, have appeared not only as the result of a false approach to concrete questions of interethnic cohabitation, but also as a result of certain weakening of the socialist and spiritual and ideological basis on which society rests. The solution of national problems is possible only in the channel of the full-blooded process of

perestroyka guaranteeing democratization of all facets of social life and strengthening the ideological base of socialism.

We are convinced that the levelling out of the rights and duties of the Russian Federation within the framework of an integral Soviet federal state will further this process. The people of the republic are increasingly insistently coming out in favor of the formation in the Russian Federation of administrative and managerial structures similar to those that exist in other union republics and for raising the status of autonomous formations. The relevant proposals on the reconstitution of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and a number of other proposals have already been presented to the party Central Committee, to the government, the USSR Supreme Soviet by the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the RSFSR.

The negative aspects arising in relation to Russians in some republics are giving rise to resentment and indignation in the public of Russia, the speaker stated. Our internal difficulties in resolving the nationalities' question is also cause for concern. In the first instance, this is—how can the injustice committed in the years of Stalinism with respect to a whole series of peoples of the Russian Federation, who were forcibly moved from their native places, be overcome once and for all.

At the plenum, the procedure should be determined for the formation of the elements of sociopolitical structures which are lacking in Russia. The opinion is voiced on the need for forming a Russian organization within the framework of the CPSU. At the plenums of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] and the Komsomol Central Committee, there was talk of the need to create relevant Russian structures in these organizations, too. Probably, it would be advisable to charge the Central Committee Politburo with introducing proposals on the formation of a Central Committe Bureau on the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and to determine the periods of the convocation of a conference of party organizations of the Russian Federation.

There is no doubt, the speaker stressed, that we are acting correctly when, in formulating concepts in the sphere of national relations, we particularly single out the question of the party. Our whole experience confirms that only a united party is capable of guaranteeing a truly internationalist approach to the development of the whole of society and of each of its component parts.

G.V. Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, said that the draft party platform is, as recognized by the people of Georgia, on the whole a real contribution to the Leninist nationality policy, to the improvement of interethnic relations. Nontheless, it does not sufficiently strengthen the laws which sometimes contain clauses that cancel each other out, as has been reflected in our comments and proposals addressed to the CPSU Central Committee.

The effectiveness of such decisions can be ensured only as a result of the rejection of stagnant stereotypes, of the granting to republics of the opportunity to take decisions independently and voluntarily in the majority of cases, proceeding from the specific special features, on which functional obligations they are justified, in their view, in delegating to the center. To do this, the information channels must be considerably expanded first and foremost. We have lifted the veil slightly on military expenditures, but that is only the beginning. The people have the right to learn reliable information about the way that the collective funds accumulated in the union budget are spent, since this corresponds to their interests.

G.V. Gumbaridze spoke about the need for greater differentiation both in implementing major economic projects being financed centrally depending on the specific interest in it of one republic or another. It is precisely for this purpose that on the initiative of the republican party organization and the public a draft concept for the national development of the Georgian SSR has been worked out at the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee.

The key to resolving the problem is also seen in the expansion of the rights of the union republics in the sphere of regulating interethnic relations on their territory which should find more precise reflection in the CPSU platform. Encroaching on the sovereignty of the republic in deciding controversial questions in this sphere, as we have become convince from experience, only aggravates the problems, imparting to them a chronic nature. There are obvious symptoms of the facts that excesses perpetrated on interethnic grounds are often programmed beforehand and are aimed at demanding the imposition of a curfew or the introduction of a special form of administration, which means renouncing democratic principles, being deflected from the course we have set. One even gets the feeling that certain actions are being artificially provoked to back up particular theorizings and schemata in the sphere of interethnic relations.

The speaker continued, saying that during the events which recently took place in the republic for interethnic reasons, many of the mass news media demonstrated a total lack of objectivity. To make unjust accusations against a people which has centuries-old traditions of interethnic contacts, and which is living side by side with representatives of more than 80 nations, even the least numerous of which have ben provided with conditions enabling them over the centuries to preserve their unique character, culture, and language. [as received] One must take a very understanding approach to the problems of a small republic which nevertheless has in its composition three autonomies: the Abkhaz and Adzhar Autonomous Republics, the South-Ossetian Autonomous Oblast, a republic where instruction in the schools is conducted in eight languages: Georgian, Russian, Abkhazi, Ossetian, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Estonian, and Greek; where radio programs go on the air in seven languages, and newspapers are published in six languages.

After recounting the measures that have been taken by the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee to develop Abkhazi culture and to improve the standard of living of the population of Abkhaziya, the speaker said that only one who is striving, under cover of national interests, to push through his own egotistical aspirations and ambitions, only an obvious enemy of perestroyka, could in these conditions criminally infringe upon the peace and calm of his own people, and provoke an interethnic conflict in a land whose history has known no such conflicts. At the present time, an investigation is being conducted under the strict supervision of the USSR Procurator's Office and with the participation of representatives of the law enforcement bodies of certain of the union republics.

Our party, having firmly embarked upon the path of renewal, must become for the peoples and for the workers the main uniting political force, having turned its face toward the national problems and grappled with them directly. It must ensure consolidation by establishing the new principles of its nationalities policy, said the speaker.

V.I. Potapov, first secretary of the Irkutsk Oblast Party Committee, fully supported the position set out in the report that one of the main reasons for the tension in the sphere of interethnic relations is the extreme inequality in the social development of a number of regions, the damage to their interests caused by the departmental dictate and by distortions in investment policy.

However, while giving a positive assessment of the party document as a whole, the speaker stressed that it did not cover all aspects and did not contain a search for the paths toward full equality of rights. Take, for example, the question of restructuring the legal status and national-state structure of the RSFSR. The fact that these problems are allotted a separate section is good. But the speaker believes, these problems have been only worked out half- heartedly and do not take account of the new realities which have recently arisen in the country. On the one hand we call for the republics to be given genuine autonomy. On the other hand we put them in an unequal position, in particular regarding issues of party and social construction.

The section in the platform about creating within the structure of the CPSU Central Committee a bureau of the Central Committee to work with the party organizations of the RSFSR does not remove the problem, in his view. On the contrary, it creates a new and ineffective level of party management. It is necessary to go further in resolving this question. The question of creating a Communist Party of the RSFSR and its Central Committee should be examined at our discretion in the near future.

On the subject of the management of the economy of the RSFSR, he noted that in his opinion the regional approach is the most successful form of economic management.

He expressed his opinion, too, on the delicate question of the principle of self-determination. As is known, the legal norms concerning this issue are set out in the USSR Constitution and in the CPSU platform. However, in the view of the speaker in political and social practice it is necessary to restrict the possibility and the necessity for a particular republic to secede from the union. Thus, he cited the example that in the Baltic republics there is active discussion of the question of the possibility of leaving the USSR and there are very few people talking about whether this step is essential now and whether it is in the interests of the Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian peoples as a whole. In the final analysis, who has studied the actual opinion of all the working people of the Baltic region?

The speaker recalled the speeches at the first Congress of Peoples Deputies by a number of peoples representatives who warned of possible, and even unpredictable, consequences in the Baltic region. Unfortunately, the voice of the peoples deputies, behind whom stand thousands of people, it seems, were not listened to. And things here are becoming increasingly drastic. We are faced with blatant nationalism and chauvinism, the whipping up of interethnic dissention, the speaker said, and the law is remaining silent even though no one has rescinded responsibility for these illegal actions. He stressed that under the pretext of resolving nationalities' issues the economy is being shaken absolutely to pieces. The knot of social problems is being pulled tighter and tighter and then these misfortunes are beginning to be felt and on the basis of these to wear down those who are doing something, however much it may be, to the good.

The speaker said that the degree of tolerance by the party Central Committee Politburo about preventing the party from, so to say, falling apart and the economy from becoming shaky was incomprehensible. With great conviction and resolve he supported what had been said in the report about the need to establish discipline and order everywhere. He also fully supported the statement of the CPSU Central Committee about the situation in the Baltic republics. The speaker noted that it is now no longer enough to give assessments and to state facts. It is decisive practical actions that are needed. It is essential, for the sake of the future to defend the fundamental values of the proletarian internationalism of the Soviet federation. A.M.K. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, said that today it is necessary to define the main links in the chain of intra-nationalities relations which, when grasped can pull the whole chain. One of such links is the very complex question that needs an immediate solution and that can be formulated as such: either a real union of equal sovereign states-republics will be created, as defined in our Constitution, in which they will have a real both political and economic interest, or efforts to build a democratic socialist state can be ruined.

We all have to admit, the speaker stressed, that the situation in various places of the country speaks namely about the latter. Intra-nationalities' conflicts today are

on one hand an expression of very acute socioeconomic problems, and on the other hand an expression of contradictions between interests of individual union republics and the centralized state. Thus, it would not be right to reckon that all is taking place today in the republic is a local phenomenon. These processes are a reflection of deep movements which are taking place in the party, in the country as a whole. Their acute and unusual character are yet another argument for admitting the following fact: political and socioeconomic processes in the Lithuanian SSR are flowing more intensely. This is fraught with a certain danger. This concern has been reflected also in the CPSU Central Committee statement "on situation in Soviet Baltic republics."

Evaluating the situation in Lithuania, the speaker noted that it can be characterized by increased heat of political passions, by activity of broad strata of the population, by stormy growth of its national self-consciousness. The Lithuanian Communist Party is the center of the political life, as well as the informal movement, Sajudis. Their interrelations, to a decisive extent, define the direction and polarity of processes taking place in Lithuania. At the same time glasnost and democratization have enabled a great number of informal organizations of various directions to enter the political arena.

Speaking about forces in the republic for which the independence and sovereignty are linked with leaving the Soviet Union, the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee underlined that the position of communists just as the position of all people with common sense in the republic is quite clear: Lithuania as integrated in the union economy has such political, cultural, and simply human ties that the break away from them would be destructive.

Sharpening of intra-nationalities relations is brought about even more by the worsening economic situation. The way out of the crisis is in giving economic independence of the republic. This does not at all mean isolation, but on the contrary, envisions a broad mutually advantageous ties with other republics and other states.

The speaker noted that in the historic part of the CPSU platform, together with the condemnation of administrative-command methods established in the sphere of nationality policy, the Stalinist crimes against the people of the USSR, including the people of Lithuania, are insufficiently precisely listed and condemned. In Lithuania alone one person in ten was sentenced and banished without justification. Clearly condemning the Stalinist policy directed against Soviet peoples, the Lithuanian Communist Party is most definitely against the identification (as some do) of Stalinism with Russians or any other peoples of our country. This is, the speaker said, our principled position.

He noted that the present program and the CPSU statutes in many respects are in contradiction with the real perestroyka of the renewal of the union and need radical changes. This is why many communists reckon that the extent of the political and economic independence of the republic require an adequate independence of the leading political force, its Communist Party.

The life shows convincingly that democratic changes in the party must take place faster than changes in the society as a whole. In the opposite case the party's lagging behind in political processes taking place in the society is unavoidable. The present status of Communist Parties of union republics does not correspond to the legal situation of sovereign republics in the union of the SSR. These and some other reasons have contributed to the fact that many party organizations in Lithuania have put forward an idea of renewal of independence of the republic's Communist Party with its statutes and program corresponding to historic realities, national specific character, and the future sovereignty of the republic.

Unavoidably, the problem of renewal emerges, of changes in the CPSU organizational system based today indeed not on principles of democratic centralism in Leninist understanding but on principles of centralism, the speaker said.

Yu. D. Maslyukov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR Gosplan said that the methods of administration which prevailed in previous years, had given rise to a number of negative consequences, many functions of administration, unjustifiably drawn together into the center, and the economic base and the rights of union republics were narrowed.

The result of all this was that the republics and the regions became less interested and that their opportunities were reduced to influence to process of development as a whole, the results of the economic activity of enterprises situated on their territory and the efficiency of production. This has had as a consequence a lessening of their role and of their responsibility for improving the living conditions of the population, and recently for the fact that the interregional and interethnic relations have become more complicated.

The economic content of self-determination and sovereignty in present-day conditions, as is noted in the draft platform, finds expression in the change-over of the republics to financial autonomy and self-financing. This is one of the most important areas of the radical economic reform which is being carried out in the country.

He reported that the USSR State Planning Committee, together with other economic bodies of the councils of ministers of the union republics, is carrying out specific preparatory work on the change-over of the union republics, Moscow and Moscow oblast and a few other oblasts and towns to the principles of financial autonomy and self-financing from 1990 onwards. On 1 September of the current year a decision was adopted regarding the immediate measures for the change-over of the Belorussian SSR to the new conditions of management from 1990 onwards.

In accordance with the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 27 July of this year preparations are underway for the change-over of the Lithuanian SSR, the Latvian SSR, and the Estonian SSR to financial autonomy from 1 January 1990 onwards. The principles for drawing up budgets in the new conditions of management and of the transfer of enterprises to the authority of the Councils of Ministers of these republics, for the interaction of union and republican bodies, and questions of the functioning of the finance and credit system and a number of others are being worked out.

The completion of this important job, the speaker said further, is being hampered by existing differences of a fundamental nature. The concept of the Baltic republics proceeds from the condition of their exclusive ownership of natural resources, of the transfer of all enterprises under union jurisdiction into the ownership of the republics with certain exceptions—as in the proposals of the Latvian SSR—the pursuance of an autonomous [samostoyatelnyy] policy in the sphere of finances, credit and price formation, independent of the all-union policy. It is envisaged that the economic relations on the territories of the republics will be regulated only by republican laws and that the relations with the union the SSR and with other republics will be built only on treaty principles.

The adoption of the concepts being proposed by the Baltic republics, the speaker said, can lead to serious negative consequences. In the interests not only of the Union as a whole, but also of each union republic one must not be confined within the boundaries of one's own territory but works towards the development of a single market. Then many questions will be resolved not to the detriment of each other but in the interests of everyone and of the country as a whole.

The speaker dwelled especially on the proposal of the Baltic republics to transfer to their authority all enterprises, including the enterprises which make up the most important all-union systems. He voiced the firm conviction that this may lead to a lowering of the efficiency of social production because of the under-utilization of the advantages of territorial division of labor.

Taking into account the complex problems of transferring the union republics to financial autonomy and self-financing, and the fact that many theoretical questions have been incompletely studied, and considering that the appropriate laws have not been adopted and that there is no legal back-up, the speaker believes that the change-over of republics and regions to economic independence should be implemented in stages. This fundamental tenet was discussed and supported at the CPSU Central Committee meeting on 13 September with the leadership of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic's.

Proceeding from this, we regard 1990 as the transitional stage toward the realization of the new management mechanism. This does not rule out widening the degree of independence of the republics and the transfer to them of individual enterprises at this stage.

The speaker said it is intended to abandon the practice of setting the republics a state order for the volume of marketing paid services, for retail trade turnover, for handing over operation of amenities in the sociocultural sphere, and in the municipal economy. The aforementioned questions will be tackled independently by the councils of ministers of the union republics. For the Baltic union republics and the Belorussian SSR, which will be transferred to the principles of financial autonomy from 1990 onward in contradistinction to the other republics, the limits on centralized state capital investments are set as a whole, without being broken down by industries and areas.

In conclusion, the speaker said that the proposals voiced in the report and in the speeches mean that the basic sectors of industry; the system of defence sectors of industry; railway, maritime and aviation transport; pipelines and power engineering must for the time being remain within the jurisdiction of the center. Afterward, as financially autonomous relations develop, the republics' rights in administering certain industries will widen.

S.G. Arutyunyan noted that those who are looking for identical causes for the exacerbation of interethnic relations in all the republics, and corresponding universal recipes for resolving the conflicts, are very much mistaken. Each region has its own specifics, without an understanding of which the right approaches cannot be found.

The present sociopolitical situation in Armenia is affected both by the echo of the past and by present realities. By virtue of historical circumstances, the people are split into factions which are drawn toward each other. Exacerbated by the interethnic and natural cataclysms of today, historical memory has affected, and could not have failed to affect, the psychology and mood of the people and the way they feel. And it is here, the speaker considers, that one must seek the key to an understanding of what is happening in the republic today. To lay all the responsibility on the intrigues of the extremists, he continued, would be a great oversimplification of the real issue, and would mean depriving oneself of the possibility of finding true ways out of the crisis.

Armenia is living through a tempestuous time. The increased political activeness of the masses, tardiness in untying the Karabakh knot, the escalation of tensions with Azerbaijan, and the blockade, have created a near-critical situation in the republic.

The republic party organizations have very limited possibilities of settling the conflict themselves, as the events of the past few days very clearly demonstrate. The accords achieved during the meeting of the two bureaus of the Communist Party Central Committees of the neighboring republics have been virtually nullified,

wrecked by economic pressure on Armenia and the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast].

The bleeding wound of Nagorno-Karabakh imparts dramatic tension and acuteness to the situation in the region, the speaker said. The NKAO question is not a territorial dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan. It has been raised, the speaker considers, not by Armenia, but by the people of Nagorno-Karabakh itself. It must be regarded only as an issue of people's self-determination. What is an issue is a people's expression of its will, a people's sovereign right. To disregard that right, said the speaker, would be to discredit the nationalities policy of the party.

It is correctly stated in the CPSU platform that the Nagorno-Karabakh problem must be resolved on a constitutional, legal, and democratic basis, openly, and with the mandatory participation of all the parties concerned. I think said S.G. Arutyunyan, that it is of fundamental importance to include in that list a nation's right to self-determination, without which, as we know, there cannot be a genuinely democratic nationalities policy.

We must assess the situation realistically. In the present situation, with mutual distrust, intolerance, and hostility having accumulated on both sides, compromise is the; only solution. A sensible step in this direction, he considers, would be to grant Nagorno-Karabakh the status of an autonomous territory under Union jurisdiction. In other words, Nagorno-Karabakh would in reality be subordinated to the center, and the oblast, party, and local soviet bodies would be reinstated.

The strategy of the party's nationalities policy, as enshrined in the CPSU platform, is today determined by the further development of the foundations of socialist federalism, the deepening of the union republic's independence, the introduction of regional financial autonomy, and a number of other radical measures. The speaker considered it necessary to reflect the general principle that the Soviet Federation is a union not only of the union republics, but also of the autonomous formations. This will serve to emphasize that all nations and ethnic groups have equal independence and equal opportunities for intellectual, cultural, economic, and social development.

We must, he said, make ours an open federation and give the autonomous formations the right to come to the supreme bodies of the country with proposals for enhancing their autonomous status. It would be possible to envisage a system of treaty-governed relations among the national-territorial formations on the same footing as the union republics with the union of SSR. In that case, in the speaker's view, the form of self-determination becomes universal in character.

The realities of the present day insistently dictate the need to interpret the right of the nations to self-determination not so much from the aspect of the possible secession of one or other of the republics from the USSR, but rather of the self-determination of the peoples within the framework of the Soviet federation.

While in no way relieving myself of responsibility, said the speaker, I should nevertheless like to say that the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo have also not infrequently been late with their political assessments and practical measures to untie the 'tight knots' of interethnic relations. There are issues which can and must be decided by the USSR Supreme Soviet, the country's government and the CPSU Central Committee, and we have a right to expect of them greater resoluteness, greater consistency and greater efficiency.

A.N. Girenko, first secretary of the Crimean Oblast party committee, noted that the success of perestroyka is directly linked with the stability of the all-union home. This is a radical issue of principle. The main principle of the approach toward the resolution of national contradictions under the conditions of perestroyka lies in the optimal combination of national and overall state interests and in the voluntary alliance of the peoples of our multinational country.

The further strengthening of scientific and theoretical elaborations of nationalities policy and the search for new and unusual practical approaches for its implementation seem necessary, he said. It would be expedient to form an all-union scientific research institute on the problems of interethnic relations with branches attached to the central committees of the union republics and to create corresponding sub-divisions in the higher party schools for deeper study of the theory and practice of the nationalities issue by party cadres and ideological workers.

Having touched on the language issue, the speaker decisively supported the proposal stated in the report on the necessity of having the Russian language as the all-union state language. This together with a national state language in each republic may resolve many contradictions.

The Crimea also endures shocks connected with the Stalinist deformations of nationalities policies and with the unfounded charge of betrayal against peoples, in particular against the Crimean Tatars who were deported to eastern regions of the country. The people's memory is alive. And now 45 years later, the problem of the Crimean Tatars, a large portion of whom live outside the Crimea is one of the factors which is seriously complicating the situation in the oblast. The new thinking and logic of perestroyka compell us to find a solution to this extremely complicated problem. A solution may only be found if there is a combination of the interests of the population living in the Crimea, and this is two and half million people, with the national interests of the Crimean Tatars.

Special anxiety, not only among the inhabitants of the Crimea, but also among the public at large, the speaker continued, is being aroused by the construction of the Crimean atomic power station. The issue, which has

practically been resolved, of a change in its character, is for some reason constantly put off.

The resettlement of the Tatars, which will demand supplementary material and financial resources amounting to more than a billion roubles, is possible only if based on a specially elaborated state program which includes, in particular, the creation of new jobs, the construction of accomodation, education, and the corresponding infrastructure.

At present, the speaker continued, the leaders of the Crimean Tatar national movement, who tend toward extremism, are inciting their compatriots outside the Crimea to sell their homes or abandon them, to travel en masse, uncontrolled, to the oblast, to seize without authorization land being built on, and not to submit to local authorities. This leads to unjustified sufferings among the people and also provokes anti-Tatar attitudes.

The speaker addressed comrades from Uzbekistan and Krasnodar Kray, where a significant number of Crimean Tatars live, with a request that they immediately intensify their work in elucidating among the population the complete perniciousness of such hasty and unconsidered actions. In the speech, the issue of adopting a special law on the Crimea, with which its special status in the existing structure of our state is to be defined, was raised.

B.I. Oleynik, writer and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet of Nationalities, said that if there are still people who are even now looking for reasons for the gloomy state of society in the biology of the socialist system, of bad management, of indiscipline, extravagance, and sloth, in the expense caused by the national character, these are only a consequence. The first cause of all these sad deformations is in the violation of the fundamental system—feelings of attachment to the native nest—and in loss of respect for one's father, mother, for one's [native] area, for the graves of one's ancestors; in a word, it is the lowering to zero of the threshold of accountability to one's forebears and contempoaries, thue loss of conscientiousness, which lies at the base of personal worth, that holds us all back from falling face first into the dirt before our relatives, our countrymen, our home collective and finally before our homeland. We have revealed all our sores, and now it is necessary to switch to constructive solutions, he said.

I fully support the party platform on the nationality question, the speaker noted.

S.K. Grossu, first secretary of the Communist Party of Moldavia Central Committee, took the platform.

The sources of the flare-up of the radical views on the nationality question have been talked about on more than one occasion, he said. Today, in analyzing them, again we have striven to more deeply assess their negative effects on interethnic relations, the crisis situation in the economy, the lack of attention to social needs, how national relations are in oblivion, and most importantly, we are trying to find that creative potential, the implementation of which will lay the foundation for harmonizing interethnic relations in the future.

In order to resolve this task, to free ourselves of past mistakes, a radically renewed nationality policy is needed which corresponds to the demands, to the spirit, of our perestroyka. It seems to us that the CPSU platform, which the plenum is considering, is fully able to serve as a basis for such a policy.

In his speech, the first secretary of the Communist Party of Moldavia Central Committee dwelt in particular on the problem of strikes, which have not only damaged the economy, broken obligations and led to the loss of materials, but have even more destabilized the social and political situation in the republic. In this connection, the speaker considers it acutely necessary to put before the USSR Supreme Soviet the question of acelerating the passage of a legislative act, which regulates such forms of protest.

The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has examined the sociopolitical situation and the reasons which lead to the strikes at a number of the republic's enterprises. Measures have been taken to stabilize the situation, and the main attention is being paid to the expansion of social and cultural problems. A comprehensive state program for guaranteeing the functioning of languages on Moldavian SSR territory has been elaborated.

The growth in the scale and the complexities of the transforamtions happening now, and the acuteness of the problem of interethnic relations oblige us to look more intently at the activity of the CPSU Central Committee as the ruling core of our party, the speaker stressed. We do not always see the clear line of the Central Committee in many matters nor the depth of their study. Sometimes an uncertainty, a wait-and-see position can be sensed in the addresses by the Central Committee leaders.

Communists want to see in practice results of the Central Committee's activity in overcoming negative encrustations on perestroyka and in working out the foundations for ways of consolidation, not only in matters of interethnic relations, but also in the guaranteeing of the integrity and durability of our party and in its renewal.

The floor was given to V.I. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee.

The biggest mistake today is to see danger only from one flank and to combat it from the positions of the other extreme, he said. We are convinced that the Communist Party of Estonia, relying on the healthy political core of society and having its own program of actions, is capable of neutralizing extremism, providing constructive leadership for perestroyka, and of continuing the radical renewal of our life. But this is under one condition: That the people well understand that perestroyka began in Moscow, that perestroyka was started by the party and

can continue successfully in the localities only with the support of the Central Committee.

Right from the start, the Estonian people warmly welcomed perestroyka, seeing in it a real opportunity for improving their life and for national rebirth. I wish to say quite definitely—and this was shown by our recent party plenum—we see our further way forward only in close consolidation with the forces of perestroyka of ithe whole country. Our aim is a sovereign Estonia in a renewed federation of Soviet peoples.

We share the CPSU Central Committee's concern, expressed in the statement about the situation in the Baltic reigon, at the actions here of certian separatist forces, and at the destablization of the political situation. But in so far as we talk about party trust, it would probably have been better if we, the leaders of the Baltic republics, had taken part in drawing up this document.

We must construct such a union that no one would even think of leaving. Then, there would be no question of separatism. Our common task is to make the country into one in which it would be good for all peoples, both large and small to live, in which each people whould have a reliable home, sufficiency, and order, which it would provide itself by right of being the master. That is why we come out for the sovereignty of the republic and we can no longer imagine our future without it.

The nation is the fundamental form of the existence of mankind with its roots in the distant past and the foreseeable future and in the national culture which is formed over centuries, absorbing the experience of generations is the basis of values common to all mankind. It is precisely nations and peoples, and not the formless mass of people which are the subjects of history. Destruction of their integrity leads inevitably to a decrease in morality, to the deformation of culture, neglect of the everyday environment, to ecological anomalies, and finally to stagnation. From here stems the need for a differentiated approach to each nation, for recognition of the need for there to be many different variants for their development.

Now, he went on to say, our main efforts are concentrated on the economy, on moving over to republican financial autonomy and elaborating the new mechanism of economic management. He told how the preparations for this important step were being conducted.

Economic independence, the speaker continued, is now the only alternative for Estonia. The political background is too serious to proceed here from the honor of the uniform. Perestroyka needs, first and foremost, positive improvements in the economy, and as quickly as possible.

Our republic supports the democratic direction of the CPSU platform, its lines of developing the sovereignty of the national republics. However, we shall be very attentive to ensure that not a single milligram of recurrences of the mistakes of the past appears in this supremely important document, the speaker noted.

S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, said that the question of the future of the USSR, about strengthening the voluntary union of Soviet peoples and intensifying their international cohesion, is one of the fundamental issues of the party's nationalities policy. We Communists are responsible for the country's future and for the future of socialism, which is now inseparable from the success of perestroyka. Today these words are a warning from the lips of history itself. It asks point-blank—did the events of recent months, which have developed on the national arena, happen or not; will our federation and our Union survive or not? Today, in several areas, the growth of national self-awareness has become a factor conducive not to bringing peoples together but to separating them.

The nationalities question comprises part of mankind's international experience. The future of our country, indeed of the world as a whole, lies in integration and internationalization, coupled with true sovereignty of equality of peoples. This is progress in mankind's generally accepted understanding of the word.

During the current reports-back and elections, increasing demands from below on leaders for the results of their work have become evident. To ensure the future cohesion of party ranks and the renewal of the activity of all links of the party, it is necessary to carry out resolute demarcation, going so far as excluding from the ranks of the CPSU those who have taken up nationalist positions and who, either by their passiveness or lack of principles, are weakening party unity.

We are firmly convinced that if we do not have accord between nationalities and friendship among the peoples, there will be no effective progress along the path of socialist renewal and real improvement in people's lives, the speaker noted.

I am deeply convinced, noted D.G. Zavgayev, first secretary of the Chechen-Ingush party obkom, that what has long been lacking in our work in improving interethnic relations is a fruitful, realistic, scientific concept which, backed up by a Leninist understanding of the problem, would accumulate the experience of present-day practice. Now, the approaches to this have been determined in the CPSU platform. Yet one feels that, in practice, we are still using the trial-and-error method: Either by striking out completely all we have achieved in this sphere or, vice-versa, by making an idol of it.

The speaker touched upon the complexities which have come about in assessing the state of interethnic relations, pointing out that it is not only political, but also economic and personnel decisions which are exerting an influence here. The whole complex of socioeconomic factors operating in the country makes up the complicated infrastructure of interethnic relations, he noted. In a word, in Chechen-Ingushetiya no grudges are held against the Kazakhs, certain representatives of whom

have actually banished our countrymen from Novyy Uzen. This is a question not of interethnic relations, but of an unbalanced social policy which erupts wherever things are delicate. We recall how the fraternal Kazakh and other peoples helped us during the most grave period of banishment, and at that time these relations were truly both inter-national and, well, simply humane.

The speaker gave specific examples of the need for a more balanced approach to events in the sphere of interethnic relations.

An extremely important problem, the speaker said, is a proper understanding at the center of the real processes going on in the republics and the autonomous areas. Here, too, I would like to point out a few things. Not all is satisfactory regarding the ocmpetence of those among the supreme party bodies who present a picture of the situation in this or that area, or regarding their true responsibility for the information which forms the basis of their political decisions. The responsibility of the Central Committee apparatus for true and genuine information without going too far and laying things on too thick is immense, and this must be understood, the speaker said.

Various opinions are emerging today about the prospects for the development of interethnic relations. We have only just begun to study this problem seriously and purposefully, avoiding illusions. This is the first sign that the problem in the country will be solved, the speaker noted.

PRAVDA Apologizes to Yeltsin for Reprint Story

PM2109122189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Sep 89 Second Edition p 7

[Announcement by PRAVDA editorial board "In Connection with the Publication on B.N. Yeltsin in the newspaper LA REPPUBLICA"]

[Text] On the editorial board's instruction V. Linnik, our correspondent in the United States, talked with Vittorio Zucconi, author of the article which appeared in the Italian newspaper LA REPUBBLICA, and which was reprinted in PRAVDA. Asked whether he vouches for everything he wrote about B.N. Yeltsin in his article, Zucconi answered that he had based it on secondary sources: on an article in THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper dated 13 September, entitled "Drunkenly Embracing Capitalists," and on the testimonies of Soviet emigres who had heard conversations about Yeltsin's behavior in Baltimore.

PRAVDA's editorial board apologizes to B.N. Yeltsin. We assume that LA REPUBBLICA's editorial board will do the same for its correspondent.

Supreme Soviet Plans Investigation

LD2109151489 Moscow TASS in English 1445 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Supreme Soviet committee on glasnost and people's rights, suggestions and complaints has criticised recent stories in the Soviet press, which insulted the honour and dignity of people's deputies, and is going to investigate the circumstances under which they were published.

In a press release today it mentioned, among others, the PRAVDA reprint of an article from the Italian newspaper LA REPUBBLICA on September 18, which defamed Boris Yeltsin.

The committee described it as not only tendentious but also done in the manner of the gutter press, saying this is unacceptable for the Soviet mass media.

It added that since PRAVDA did not make any comment on the LA REPUBBLICA article, it thereby assumed responsibility for its tone and substance.

The press release also cited the example of a letter from Klaipeda carried by the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA daily and alleging that committee member Zita Slicite addressed an unauthorised rally to make anti-Soviet remarks.

Slicite herself asserts that, far from speaking at the rally, she did not even attend it.

The committee said that certain forces are attempting to sow mistrust in people's deputies, discredit them in the eyes of the electorate, play down their role in updating the country's political system, and question their moral integrity.

The committee added that this conclusion is supported by information about such attempts reaching it from the Ukraine, Siberia and Central Asian republics.

It said that the press may not contribute to these attempts, by either acting in a professionally dubious manner or publishing unchecked reports.

The committee decided to hold a special hearing to find out how several stories offering doubtful information about people's deputies appeared in the press.

Committee deputy chairman Boris Nikolskiy and other members also briefed reporters today on a draft law on the press, prepared by a committee working group.

They said that the group sought to take maximum account of world experience in this field.

The bill provides, in particular, for the right of all mass organisations, cooperatives and individuals to engage in publishing and for the right of a journalist to refuse to do an assignment if it goes against his convictions.

The draft law is now in the Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Apart from legislative work the committee is busy studying and taking action on various suggestions and complaints from people. It receives up to 1,000 letters every day. In addition, twice a week committee members hold open office hours to receive all those wishing to see them.

PRAVDA's Afanasyev Interviewed on Glasnost

PM2009091189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[Interview with Viktor Afanasyev, chief editor of PRAVDA and chairman of the USSR Union of Journalists Board, by unnamed correspondent: "Viktor Afanasyev On Glasnost"—date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] [Correspondent] How do you personally regard glasnost? How do you understand it? What, in your view, are its signs, criteria, and indicators? On what grounds in general can the state of glasnost be judged?

[Afanasyev] I regard glasnost most positively. Glasnost, in my opinion, means openness and accessibility of information. Openness means that every citizen in our country has the right to know and must know everything about everything—what is happening in our country and outside its borders. To know the truth and only the truth, without any reservations, conditions, or restrictions. Otherwise, we will receive this "truth" from various radio stations and Western newspapers which interpret events inside our country and abroad from their own standpoints, which are often hostile to ours. Furthermore, they do this extraordinarily quickly and promptly, while the information is still fresh, and the first, immediate information is the most effective, the longest-lasting.

Glasnost is inseparably linked to promptness. Our program task is to try to be as prompt as possible in the presentation of information. Of course, we cannot compete in promptness with television and radio. But we have advantages of our own which we do not always know how to use. I mean myself and my colleagues here: Learn to be prompt, truthful, and "intelligent" in the provision of information and give the most intelligent interpretation of it.

The state of glasnost, in my view, can be judged by how quickly, honestly, and truthfully we tell the world and our fellow citizens about what is going on in our country and abroad, how we view events, and what solution we find to the sometimes difficult situations which await us literally every step of the way. Timeliness, accuracy, and honesty are the foundations of glasnost. At the moment our press is still a long way from that stage. Attacking the dead (both in the literal sense and in the sense of politicians and people who no longer count) is not glasnost. Misconceived "sensations," "juicy facts," distortions, and juggling with facts are not just regrettable, they are a slander on our people and the party, whose history contains many brilliant episodes and much selflessness and heroism. We know that there are publications which pander to their readers with all this "sensationalist" claptrap. For those publications there is nothing but black in our past and present. They see nothing that is bright or good. They are not interested in the difficulties, mistakes, and shortcomings, of which we have more than enough. They do not even try to find a way to resolve our distressing problems. They have no constructive proposals to offer.

What is this then—upside-down glasnost? I may be wrong but I think that all this rummaging around in the dirty linen of our history is a very subtle method of avoiding the solution of contemporary problems.

No, I am not against criticism. Criticism is as important to us as the air we breathe. But it is necessary to criticize the living, those who are now obstructing perestroyka; it is necessary to talk about specific omissions and mistakes, and to criticize those who are stopping us from living and working in a modern way. But most important, criticism must be constructive. Criticism not for its own sake but to find ways and means of curing the ills which afflict our society. That is how I understand glasnost.

[Correspondent] What can you tell us about the development of glasnost since the April 1985 plenum? Is it proceeding smoothly or not? Can one talk about stages of development? And if so, what are their characteristics?

[Afanasyev] Prior to April 1985 the conditions for the establishment of glasnost were still only being created. Even though individual press organs had ventured to go beyond the prescribed framework. The party newspapers were more restrained, although back in 1977 PRAVDA published a series of articles by D. Valovoy on improving the economic mechanism in which he sharply criticized gross output—the volume of output sales in rubles as the main planning and accounting indicator in the economy. We were severely reprimanded for that. And I was "carpeted" for V.A. Trapeznikov's article "Management and Scientific and Technical Progress" in 1982.

Nevertheless, I believe (do not think this is bragging) that glasnost was given a boost by T. Samolis' article "Cleansing" in PRAVDA on 13 February 1986, which keenly raised the question of the bureaucracy ensconced in party and state organs, the question of privilege, and so on.

PRAVDA was criticized for that article at the 26th party congress but soon the term "cleansing" became a symbol of perestroyka: Perestroyka is impossible without a cleansing of the negative phenomena of the past. That is axiomatic.

It is hard to determine the stages of glasnost's development, but nevertheless I shall try to say something about it. First the ripening of the preconditions and conditions

for glasnost (from April 1985 to February 1986). The development of glasnost and its deepening and expansion up to the present day. All this time glasnost was primarily critical. Everything was criticized—our history and the present day. Now glasnost is gradually acquiring a positive dimension. In addition to criticism, the greatest significance is being attached to seeking, supporting, and disseminating the experience of perestroyka. It turned out that our press was unready for this change of direction in the glasnost sphere. It proved easier for us to criticize scathingly than to seek what was good and fine in our life. In PRAVDA we constantly feature the rubrics "Talking About First Secretaries" and "Perestroyka—Where Experience Is Located."

Under the first rubric we talk about the great role played in perestroyka by our best party committee first secretaries—from rayon to republic Central Committees—and we try to show their dedication to the cause of the people and the party and ability to restructure themselves in the best way. We have printed about 70 essays on first secretaries. The second rubric is more complicated. There are reasons for that. There is still only little advanced experience in life, very little. Furthermore, we journalists have still not learned how to find that experience and, most importantly, we do not know how to write about it vividly and convincingly. That is why, I think, some press organs continue to take critical and sometimes captious stances.

I believe that this craze will pass. The stock of previously banned works and memoirs of victims will be exhausted. And the shortcomings in our life, we hope, will diminish. The apologists of blanket criticism will be forced to change their swords for plowshares.

[Correspondent] What new features has glasnost acquired since the 19th party conference? Has the party conference resolution on glasnost achieved anything? What in general is the role of party organs, including those at the very top, and of the party as a whole in developing glasnost?

[Afanasyev] The 19th party conference gave a powerful new fillip to the development of glasnost. It adopted the resolution "On Glasnost." In this way glasnost, its essence, and its paths of development were given general party significance, recognition, and support. The doors were opened for the development of glasnost, and zones previously exempt from criticism were opened up, too. A powerful boost was given to the struggle against bureaucracy—the most dangerous and powerful opponent of glasnost. The resolution "On the Struggle Against Bureaucracy" was adopted.

But in my view the resolution "On Glasnost" made a mistake.

This is an important thesis. "Glasnost," the resolution notes, "presumes the social, legal, and moral responsibility of the mass media. A high level of ideology and morality, competence, strict observance of professional ethics, and unfailing reliability of information are essential requirements in this sphere." All this is absolutely correct, timely, and justified. After all, it is no secret that our press still often contains articles that are dull, one-sided, and express group interests, articles which contain distortions and inaccuracies, and sometimes patent lies. Undoubtedly press workers and above all leaders of press organs must bear responsibility—legal and moral—for all this. We are bearing that responsibility and are ready to go on doing so.

But further on we read that the resolution asserts the "right of of each citizen subjected to criticism to publish a reasoned reply in that same press organ." But what if that reply contains obvious disinformation and takes an antiparty or even anti-Soviet and antisocialist position, or a position which crudely insults the party, the state, or their leaders? Should that be printed too?!

The resolution "On Glasnost" was adopted on Friday, 1 July 1988. But by Saturday one "great historian of our time" had already submitted an article in reply to PRAVDA's criticism of his views, which were far from those of the party's position. This opus, published by our paper, provoked a sharp protest from many of our readers.

I admit that we journalists are anxiously awaiting the Law on the Press. The drafts which I have seen contain too many sanctions against journalists. I should like the law to provide a balance between journalists' rights and responsibility. The law is meant to give journalists freedom to obtain and use information. At the same time, it should envisage journalists' responsibility for the truthfulness, accuracy, and reliability of information.

By all accounts, some party organs are trying to stifle the press and with it glasnost, and to put journalists "in their place." Either they do not respond to criticism at all or they give a purely formal reply. They are inured to criticism, they have adapted to it. The 19th party conference decisions have been partially forgotten. Fortunately, the first session of the Congress of People's Deputies and the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet have revived criticism and glasnost.

I cannot deny that the 19th party conference partially lifted the veil on one of the most acute and complex questions of our life—interethnic relations (a relevant resolution has been adopted). The conference warned, cautioned, and expressed concern at the state of those relations. That was before Tbilisi, Fergana, Novyy Uzen, and other trouble spots, although there had been Sumgait and Nagorno-Karabakh. But now events in the sphere of interethnic relations have acquired a most acute crisis character. We have before us, M.S. Gorbachev has said, a crisis which, if not checked, could destroy perestroyka.

Here, too, our press has by no means set the best example. Some of our colleagues have forgotten that they are Soviet citizens and Communists and have adopted the position of forces which cannot be called healthy.

In reporting on interethnic relations we journalists still have much to rethink. Glasnost, yes. But accuracy, balance, and moderation in the presentation and interpretation of facts are as vital as air. Work to consolidate nations and ethnic groups and strengthen our great union is the task of the day, the supreme task, if you will.

[Correspondent] Should there be any limitations on glasnost today or is it a blessing of which you can never have enough? Can people use glasnost to their own detriment? Is this not happening in some parts of the country? What in general are glasnost's development trends in our society? What are its prospects? What should we expect, what can we hope for, what should we fear?

[Afanasyev] I have already given a partial reply to that question. There must be no restrictions on glasnost. Both in the negative and the positive sense. True, journalists have already done much in the criticism and exposure of problems. They should also do well when it comes to the positive reporting of the good, necessary, and businesslike things which perestroyka provides. We shouldn't miss or overlook those improvements in our work, which are as yet still small. They exist, they must be sought out, supported, and disseminated.

Of course, glasnost can be used (and is being used by some press organs) to the detriment of the people, the party, and the country. I see the main harm in the unthinking vilification and censure of all and sundry—our history, our present, and our future. Soviet people must know where we stand, where we are, what we have achieved and, by no means least, where we are going and what our ideals are. Without a future, without ideals, without clearly set goals, without the constructive solution of our most acute problems, and without the elaboration of firm guidelines and ways and means of attaining them, our life today may become pointless. But that cannot be allowed to happen. We have begun a serious discussion on socialism, its criteria, and prospects. We are calling on scientists, specialists, and practical workers to take an active part in this discussion.

Glasnost has good prospects. We are seeking to create a democratic and humane society based on the rule of law. Glasnost is an inalienable part of that society and a powerful means of its creation.

We shall not fear or have misgivings about glasnost.

[Correspondent] What real guarantees are there to ensure that the development of glasnost is irreversible? When, under what conditions, and in approximately how many years can glasnost really become the norm of life in our society?

[Afanasyev] Real guarantees of glasnost? First and foremost the Communist Party—the initiator and headquarters of perestroyka. Restructuring party ranks in the spirit of present-day demands, strengthening their unity, developing at the same time pluralism of opinions, establishing respect for the minority's opinion, completely eliminating stage management in party work and administrative edict methods in it. Increasing the intellectual and creative principle in the party, replacing commands, shouts, and threats by persuasion and by intelligent political, theoretical, and ideological work among the masses, with the masses, and with each individual person.

I am not an oracle and cannot say in how many years approximately glasnost will actually become the norm of life in our society. Time, however, does not stand still. Time flies.

Time Set for Supreme Soviet Opening

LD2109123189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] The second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will open with a joint sitting of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities on 25 September, at ten o'clock in the morning, [0600 GMT] in the sessions hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers, in the Kremlin.

Transcaucusus Pipeline Explodes; No Fatalities

LD2009184889 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] Ordzhonikidze, North Caucasus, September 20 TASS—By TASS correspondent :

A strong explosion in the night awakened the inhabitants of Ordzhonikidze—capital of North Osetia, of nearby villages Kambileyevskoye, Sunzha and Kurtat of the Prigorodniy District. A powerful jet of flame was spewed skywards at the 82nd kilometre of the main north Caucasus-Transcaucasia gas pipeline which brings gas from western Siberia to Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan.

There are no fatalities since the accident happened in the steppe. It is the crops and forests that have been damaged.

The compressor station in Mozdok was halted immediately, valves shut on the main pipeline in the villages of Olginskoye and Chermen. Repair teams got down to dealing with the damage.

The place of the accident was visited by leaders of party and economic bodies of Northern Osetia.

"The causes of the accident are being investigated by a special technical commission", the TASS correspondent was told by chief of the "Sevosgaz" management Yu. Karayev. "So far one thing is clear: the 1,200 mm pipe was ruptured. The rupture was not in the welded joint but in the middle of a pipe. It is shoddy workmanship by the manufacturing plant".

The supply of fuel to Transcaucasia will be somewhat limited since the delivery of gas now proceeds through a

standby pipeline of a lesser diameter. The situation will be brought back to normal in the coming days.

Report Released on 3 Jun Pipeline Explosion

LD1909202289 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 19 TASS—The USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Emergencies has published a report on the investigation of a pipeline explosion in Soviet Bashkiriya, which set two trains on fire.

The report says that the USSR Prosecutor's Office continues investigating the accident which took place on the night of June 3 at a pipeline going from western Siberia via the Urals to the Volga region.

The explosion occured when the two trains, going in opposite directions, had already passed one another and the distance between their last cars was 18 meters. The blast pushed these cars out of the track.

It has been established that the pipeline had been put into operation and had been operated without teleautomatic devices needed to carry out local and remote control over gate valves. Investigating officials opened and examined the pipeline on one-kilometer sections on both sides of the accident site. The examination revealed damages of the pipe's insulation coating and hollows, scuffings and scratches on the pipe, similar to ones found at the point where the pipe had exploded.

These sections are being examined by experts.

The investigators are trying to find out when and why the damages in the pipe and in the insulation had occurred, and to identify people who were working at the pipeline's section where the explosion took place.

Numerous medical examinations have been carried out, and witnesses and victims interrogated. The investigation of the accident is going on.

Internal Affairs Supply Problems Reported

LD1909211589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1230 GMT 19 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 19 Sep (TASS)—In connection with the worsening of the operational situation in the Soviet Union, the need to raise the level of provision with supplies and equipment of the country's internal affair bodies has risen sharply. A briefing which took place today at the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry pointed out the importance of this problem within the framework of stepping up measures to fight crime in the country. Thus, according to data of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, at the present time only 20-30 percent of the requirements of the internal affairs bodies, for instance, for computer equipment, are being satisfied; for radio stations this figure is 60 percent, and for the main kinds of operational-forensic equipment and line communications it is 85 percent. Twenty-six percent of motor vehicles are 10 years old or older and so on.

An analysis of the situation shows that the Internal Affairs bodies require the development, modernization, and the mastering of the series manufacture of over 300 kinds of technical facilities, including weapons for personal protection and active defense, forensic operational and computer equipment, communication facilities, motor transport, fuel and lubricants, and so on.

With the aim of resolving these and many other problems, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs has sent a package of orders, for development and series mastery of new technology in industry, to the USSR Council of Ministers. However, even at the present time active steps are being taken in that direction. Thus, within the framework of conversion, many enterprises which produced military equipment before have gone over to the manufacture of technical means to equip internal affairs bodies. The network of information banks of data on criminals is continuing to expand. In 1988 more than 32,000 crimes were exposed with their help. In this connection the need was noted for a most rapid creation of an all-Union Bank of Criminal Data. The following fact also points to the significance of technical equipment supply: in 1989, with the help of alarm systems installed in apartments and at enterprises, 11,000 persons who tried to get into them with criminal intent were detained.

The outmoded nature of existing uniforms which were established 20 years ago, it was noted at the briefing, put the question of the need to review the equipping of militia personnel and to improve uniforms and special clothing. The design of new uniforms has been entrusted to the Moscow House of Fashion, under the leadership of Vyacheslav Zaytsev.

Measures Taken To Ease Soap Shortage Detailed

PM2009160389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Put an End to the Soap Shortage"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers Presidium has discussed the question of progress in meeting targets to develop the production of soap and other detergents and the population's provision with these products.

Despite the fact that one-quarter more detergents are now being produced than a year ago, that the purchase of detergents abroad has considerably increased, and that the provision of these products is normalizing in some cities and oblasts, complaints continue to come in from customers. This is the result of panic buying, on the one hand, and unsatisfactory distribution of goods to different regions and population centers throughout the country, on the other. The attention of the leaders of the USSR Trade Ministry and the Central Union of Consumer Cooperatives has been drawn to this. They have

been instructed to regulate the detergent trade. The volume of output and import purchases established for this year exceeds last year's resources by more than 50 percent and is perfectly adequate for ending the rationing of the sale of these goods.

The USSR Council of Ministers Presidium has also warned A.A. Petrov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for the Chemical-Timber Complex, M.L. Timoshishin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases, N.V. Lemayev, USSR minister of the chemical and petroleum refining industry, and N.M. Olshanskiy, chairman of the "Agrokhim" State Association, of their personal responsibility for the production of detergents.

Particular attention has been drawn to the warning of a similar shortage in the future. Supplies of synthetic detergents in 1990 will reach 1.7 million tonnes, supplies of household soap will reach 800,000 tonnes, and supplies of toilet soap will reach 347,500 tonnes. The USSR State Planning Committee, the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, and other relevant departments have been instructed to study within 1 week the questions of backing up these planned volumes with raw materials, various ingredients, and other materials. In this same connection, the session also discussed progress in building new plants in Novomoskovsk, Sumgait, and Volgograd and retooling existing plants.

Standing organs of the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR ministries and departments, and the union republic Councils of Ministers have been instructed to draw up measures within 2 weeks to further increase the output, extend the range, and improve the quality of soap and detergents.

The session was chaired by L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

RSFSR Nationalities Commission Begins Work

PM1909175589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Commission Embarks on Work"]

[Text] The commission for questions of nationalities policy and interethnic relations in the Russian Federation, which was formed by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, met for its first session yesterday.

A report was delivered by commission chairman T.G. Ivanova, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. It was noted that the republic's working people are currently widely and committedly discussing the draft CPSU Central Committee platform "The Party's Nationalities Policy Under Present Conditions," which is of fundamental importance for the fate of perestroyka. In letters and cables sent to the commission, serious concern is expressed in connection with the exacerbation of interethnic relations in various parts of the country, including the RSFSR.

Working people are expressing very wide-ranging proposals aimed at the solution of problems connected with the legal status of the RSFSR, its national and state system, broader rights for autonomous entities, the protection of minority interests, the broad development of national cultures and mother tongues, and strengthening the friendship of the Soviet peoples.

The commission examined and approved its work plan.

Blockade at Yerevan Railroad Station Continues

NC2109110089 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1600 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Excerpts] Now we bring you a report by our colleague Rafik Grigoryan from the Yerevan railroad station:

[Begin recording] [Grigoryan] The blockade of Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast—NKAO] and the republic has created an extremely tense situation and this situation requires [word indistinct] measures. The errors resulting from the national question for the last decades are obvious.

There is no need to talk about conditions under which an entire republic, including Artsakh, survives. It is deplorable that neither the central authorities nor the central television and press devote any coverage to the situation. Rather, their equivocal statements make the situation worse. They are doing this while Armenia is under a blockade, but suddenly three trains arrived from Azerbaijan.

Was it the usual diplomatic deceit or something else? I asked Avag Khachaturyan, secretary of the party committee at Yerevan railroad branch. [passage omitted]

[Khachaturyan] The dispatch of these trains, which arrived from Azerbaijan yesterday after almost 14 days of a blockade, is a calculated move by certain Azerbaijani leaders. This is because these three trains came in over a 12-hour period and then the railroads were closed again. Second, the freight was mostly sand, empty rail cars for Ararat cement factory, building materials, and so on. They sent these just before the CPSU plenum convened to give the impression that they have opened the roads. [passage omitted]. I am coming to the conclusion that certain high level officials are not willing to end the blockade. [passage omitted]

[Grigoryan] Yes, they have no desire to end the blockade. And we ask: How long will this unbelievable and terrible blockade continue? Are we not all members of the same union? In this case discrimination is obvious.

'Deteriorating' NKAO Economy Noted

NC2109093189 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0425 GMT 21 Sep 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The paper has published a dispatch by ARMENPRES special correspondent Grigoryan on the situation prevailing in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. The economic situation in NKAO is deteriorating not daily but hourly. Raw materials essential to many production enterprises are on the verge of running out. Only diesel-powered vehicles are being used in the grape harvest, but supplies of diesel fuel are also running out.

NKAO Committee, Armenian Attitudes Assailed

PM1909142189 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 23 Aug 89 p 2

[Article by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences R. Musabekov under the rubric "Nationalities Policy: We Discuss CPSU Draft Platform": "There Is Only One Path—National Accord"]

[Excerpts] When restructuring and developing the Soviet federation, enhancing the role of national autonomy, and resolving the urgent economic and social problems of the peoples who inhabit the USSR, our prime need, as the CPSU's draft platform "Nationalities Policy of the Party Under Present Conditions" points out, is for the undistorted and complete truth about the real processes of the development of interethnic relations in the USSR and the factors which led to the occurrence of sharp clashes in interethnic affairs.

In the republic today the complex of interethnic problems centers on the problem of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. On what principles should its examination be based? What is the legal basis of the possible solutions? What result has the NKAO Special Administration Committee produced? What role can the center play in resolving the conflict? These and a number of other questions are discussed in an article by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences Rasim Nasreddin ogly Musabekov, head of an interethnic problems group of the Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol] Central Committee's Higher Komsomol School Scientific Research Center.

For more than 18 months now public life in Azerbaijan and Armenia and also in the whole country has been disturbed by the events in a small autonomous oblast with a mixed Armenian and Azerbaijani population.

Uninformed people are producing astonishingly naive plans for the immediate solution of this seemingly localized problem. However, time passes and the conflict continues to keep the populations of the two neighboring republics in a state of tension and has already led to dozens of casualties on both sides. Hundreds of thousands of people have been reduced to the position of refugees in their own country in peacetime. Strikes and demonstrations continue. Despite their increasing tiredness with the situation, people cannot break free from emotional precepts, cast off the burden of mutual insults and recriminations, and begin moving toward one another. [passage omitted]

In the course of perestroyka two trends of great significance for the future of our common home—the USSR—have clearly emerged. One is the trend toward strengthening or, rather, imparting real substance to the state sovereignty of the republics which constitute the Soviet federation. The other trend is to ensure the real rights to and strengthen the guarantees of free and worthwhile national development for all Soviet people and ethnic groups, regardless of their size or where they live.

To the sober-minded politician concerned for the future of our motherland and the fate of socialism there is no doubt that progress can be achieved only by uniting and combining both those trends. Attempts to oppose them or insist on exceptions to the general rule end in deadlock, as has been discovered in the case of the NKAO. [passage omitted]

The central authorities' actions also deserve criticism. The degree of caution and reflection in the decisions made on the NKAO so far is understandable. The center has on numerous occasions confirmed that there can be no redrawing of borders, which may lead us into deadlock. I believe that this thesis should be repeated in the CPSU platform. However, the fact that the correct decisions exist only on paper undermines the prestige of the agencies which made them and inspires hope in those who want to subject the authorities to powerful pressure. While paying lipservice to the sovereignty of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] in the NKAO, in practice the center is not fulfilling its constitutional duties toward the republic's organs of state power. The leadership of the NKAO Special Administration Committee explains this situation by citing the extremely difficult psychological atmosphere in the oblast but does little to ease it. After all, it is no secret that unhealthy attitudes are being fomented by groups of extremists guided and directed from Armenia. Considerable sums of money have been used to this end. The methods used include threats and pressure on the people who are trying to halt this madness. A large quantity of weapons has been confiscated. If these are not outright nationalist actions which should be subjected to the force of the law, I do not see the point of the well-known decree of 8 April 1989. [passage omitted]

What is the solution to the prevailing situation? The so-called "presidential" administration in the NKAO which has been suggested essentially amounts to the enshrinement in law of the existing special administration of the NKAO, which has demonstrated its ineffectiveness. Separatist leaders in the NKAO see this measure as a step toward splitting the oblast from Azerbaijan. These illusions are fostered by some highly significant details. For example, on the official forms of

the Special Administration Committee there is no indication that the NKAO belongs to the Azerbaijan SSR. With the connivance of the Special Administration Committee the tragic process of the national segregation of the oblast is continuing whereby Azerbaijanis are transported out of their villages and cities often under threat or with the use of actual violence. Yet this may also be regarded as a step toward the future territorial dismemberment of the oblast. You can see why the current situation causes legitimate concern among the Azerbaijani population.

I think that the center took an erroneous stance on the solution of the NKAO problem. Its functions include not the direct administration of the oblast but the fulfillment of its constitutional role as an independent arbiter and guarantor of the reciprocal rights and duties of the Azerbaijani republic and oblast authorities. After all, they are the sides in the conflict, not the Azerbaijan and Armenian SSR's, as it is wrongly made to seem. A compromise between the republic organs of power and the NKAO which would not render the sovereignty of the Azerbaijan SSR worthless and would expand the autonomous oblast's legal powers to the utmost is possible. And it is on this path that the solution of this protracted conflict should be sought. Here the center can make a weighty contribution by bringing both sides to the negotiating table and issuing the warning that the demand to separate the oblast from the Azerbaijan SSR is absolutely unconstitutional and whose antithesis would be a decision on the disbandment of the autonomous oblast.

The CPSU draft platform contains a provision on a mechanism for resolving conflicts between an autonomous unit and the union republic to which it belongs and assigns the role of ultimate authority to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. However, questions affecting the territorial integrity and sovereignty of a union republic cannot be the subject of such examination.

As for the Armenian SSR's stand, to be blunt, it amounts to direct encroachment on the territorial integrity of an adjacent republic and blatant interference in its internal affairs. A political and legal ruling of this kind should end the confusion among the country's public opinion, which places equal responsibility for the conflict on both sides. In urging the leadership of the Azerbaijani and Armenian SSR's to compromise and make reciprocal concessions, many people fail to understand that for Azerbaijan these concessions will inevitably lead to a renunciation of its sovereign rights to part of its age-old territory. Meanwhile the Armenian SSR will have to concede nothing here apart from moderating its own claims, which are contrary to both Soviet and international law. Clearly such a compromise is impossible.

Plainly, it should be stated categorically in the USSR Supreme Soviet that the territorial demarcation between Armenia and Azerbaijan was achieved on the basis of a compromise in the early twenties and that no border changes, especially if imposed by external strong-arm pressure, will be accepted by the Azerbaijani people under any circumstances.

However, after all the dramatic events we are receptive to good advice when it is preceded by real examples. If the 160,000 Azerbaijanis expelled from Armenia are returned to their homes and are given opportunities for meaningful national development, the concern expressed in Armenia about their fellow countrymen living in Azerbaijan will acquire a moral basis and will be heeded. Then, undoubtedly, the Azerbaijani people will do everything to ensure that the Armenians living in the NKAO and other parts of the republic do not have their national feelings infringed and are able to comprehensively exercise their economic and cultural ties with Armenia without any restrictions.

There has been much comment to the effect that Armenians are tragically enduring what they see as an unjust situation in which adjacent territories inhabited by ethnic Armenians are divided by borders. Well, the Azerbaijanis can sympathize with those feelings more than anyone else. After all, the multimillion Azerbaijani people have been divided artificially for over 150 years by the Turkmenchay Treaty and around 20 million of our fellow countrymen, according to specialists' estimates, are living on their ancient lands on the other side of the Araks River. Tens and hundreds of thousands of Azerbaijanis are living near the border in the adjacent republics. Unlike the Armenians in the NKAO they are deprived even of those opportunities represented by autonomous oblast status.

I think that today the very approach of uniting the whole territory occupied by a certain ethnic group into a single state as the precondition of national development is due to the insurmountable nature of national rivalry and enmity. In the new conditions, when humanist imperatives are beginning to determine the course of world development, to view national interests solely from the narrow standpoint of the territorial claims of one side or the other is to undermine the foundation of the peaceful future itself. Conversely, the recognition of political realities as the precondition of social calm and trust between the peoples offers scope for reciprocal cooperation and removes the barriers which complicate comprehensive contacts between the sections of a single nation divided by borders.

Lithuanian Communists To Submit Program Outline

LD2109014789 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Excerpts] A program outline of the Lithuanian Communist Party is to be submitted for a nationwide discussion shortly. As is known the Lithuanian Communist Party is not yet an independent party and as a component part of the Soviet Union it has no program of its own. In a special appeal, those responsible for drawing up the program expressed confidence that the Lithuanian Communist Party in its claim to be a political force in

building an independent and law-governed Lithuania should invariably become independent. The issue of future relations with the Soviet Communist Party dominates the Lithuanian Commnists' road to independence. These relations will take shape as perestroyka gains momentum. [passage omitted]

Meanwhile the radically-minded Lithuanian Communists in an appeal issued today maintain that independence of Lithuanian Communist Party should not be treated as plotting against the Soviet Communist Party. Nonetheless, an appeal of the (?coordinators) of the Lithuanian Communist Party program published in Lithuanian press today side-by-side with Mikhail Gorbachev's speech he made yesterday, points to the resolution of the Lithuanian Communist Party to seek independence and future cooperation with the Soviet Communist Party on parity basis.

Latvian Academic Queried on Financial Autonomy

LD2009221289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1430 GMT on 20 September broadcasts an 8-minute interview with (Sergey Leonidovich Dimanis), senior lecturer at the Latvian State University, conducted by (Yuriy Gordeyev).

(Gordeyev) interviews (Dimanis) on his views on regional financial autonomy. (Dimanis) says that they have taken the easiest path, and are drawing up a list of enterprises which are to be brought under the jurisdiction of the republican council of ministers: "That is being opposed, and it is incomprehensible as to why. The attempts to get out of any kind of subordination is typical of the economy of the union," the lecturer says. He says that the republican ministry will give the enterprises financial independence "unlike the Moscow bureaucrats." Enterprises are resisting this because they want their independence bypassing republican subordination. He looks at the EEC as an example to be emulated in economic practice, where the states are independent but interconnected: "They are united by the market and not the administrative will, of, let's say, a European center," (Dimanis) says, and advocates a similar set-up for his republic.

He says the republic's economic independence must be based on the economic independence of the enterprise, with the enterprises paying taxes to the republic. He says that various levers will be needed to regulate the economy, and lists republican and local soviet orders, pricing and credits policy, subsidy system and so forth. As for pricing policy, he says the republic must be able to raise the proportion of the contractual price of goods and levels may be imposed for obligatory sale of goods on the republican market.

In answer to the question does the Republic need its own hard currency, he says that unlike the majority of economists there, he does not think that it does. He says that it would lead to "a very serious profiteering process" as far as consumer goods are concerned. He says that administrative measures would be needed to stop people from other areas overbuying goods: "Coupons, distributed via production collectives" are the answer. A ration-card system would be needed until the system was settled. The correspondent says that the ration-card system is associated with the concept of poverty, "but we are poor, there's no getting away from it," (Dimanis) says.

He says that the economic problems of the Republic can be solved within the framework of putting the economy of the Soviet Union in order.

Baltic Border Guards Field Criticism

PM2009154589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Sep 89 First Edition p 2

[Article by own special correspondent Captain 3d Rank V. Urban: "What Is Worrying Military Men in the Baltic Today: Picket in a Border Zone Context..."]

[Text] Baltic Border Okrug—Letters about the border troops are prominent in the mail received from the Baltics. They form two converging streams, as it were.

"When will they finally remove that vestige of the iron curtain—the border zone with its barriers? This shows distrust of the local inhabitants and vacationers..." The envelope included a newspaper photograph of a picket by a border post. But then there's also the following letter: "It is easy to open the border zone, but it affords considerable protection to the ecology of the coastline and sea."

If you look at the relevant documents, in this case the Law on the State Border, you will see that the border zone is established by the USSR Government and the specific territory is determined by republic bodies and local soviets. Why, then, are the questions addressed to the border troops? It is now clear, after this hot Baltic summer, that all this is not fortuitous.

Wedge

Some questions can be answered immediately. Unduly sweeping statements have been made about the barriers, for example. The Latvian Red Riflemen outpost situated in Ventspilsskiy Rayon, had previously set up a post on the adjacent highway (which is where the the photograph mentioned by the reader was taken). All vehicles, including buses, were checked without exception. There is now free access, the border troops are on duty here only occasionally at night.

And if you try to draw the overall picture, the barriers, around 100 in all, have been removed virtually everywhere in the Baltic. The actual border procedure has been considerably simplified. If you are an inhabitant of the republic you can travel to any previously "forbidden" spot with virtually no restrictions. Such decisions have been taken in Latvia and Estonia.

Other measures should, of course, doubtless follow these first steps along the path of openness. The Baltic Border District leadership, Colonel Yu. Patinskas, deputy chief of the district's political directorate, said, insists on the need to change our approaches to protecting the border. It is up to the republic organs, we will always modify our actions, he concluded.

True, when the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers Presidium examined this question last fall pickets appeared outside the Council of Ministers building expressing the view that the border zone is a bad thing, but has to be left in order to protect the environment—the fewer people there, the better for the republic. In the summer, after the influx of vacationers, the problems became even worse. It is difficult to object in any way to nature protection slogans. What is to be done here?

Many people I have spoken to in the three republics are inclined to the view that prompt and honest information is essential. To start with, the press should publish the decisions on entry to the border zone and report who is responsible for them, since hitherto most people have supposed that this is the prerogative of the USSR KGB, which the border troops come under. Hence the tension fomented by extreme informal organizations. In any event, the old slogans of the type "Why has the KGB been given the legal right to part of our territory?" persist, as I was able to see for myself when attending certain rallies.

It turns out that some people are, as it were, specially seeking to drive a large wedge between the population and the border troops. So disputes about the Baltic economic zone, the safeguarding of which is also the [border] district's responsibility, have been added to previous ones.

The economic zone is of great national economic significance. For the country it is but one zone. True, the republics bear responsibility for nature conservancy measures here and each has its sphere of influence defined. But there is already in existence a plan to divide up the sea on an economic basis. Discussion of it is going on at the level of public organizations.

Can anything be gained by this? Specialists consider that unless order is instilled throughout the economy, success cannot be achieved in any of its "separate" sections. But the grounds for conflict are neverthless increasing.

"We Will Pay You"

"With the introduction of the economic zone, our tasks became considerably more difficult and required, in particular, that our ships be redeployed," said Captain 1st Rank V. Timofeyev, deputy chief of a Baltic Border District detachment.

The largest extent of maritime territory protected lies opposite Klaypeda, and it is there that it was decided in coordination with the Lithuanian SSR Government to set up a new ship base. The normal civil construction administration started implementing the plan.

It was planned to move in in September. With just a few tasks—in particular, the installation of equipment for the ship repair shop—remaining, a protest campaign began in the city. After an article by USSR People's Deputy V. Chyapas appeared in the newspaper, SOVETSKAYA KLAYPEDA, 15,000 people signed an appeal against the "the military facility's construction."

There is nothing easier than getting people worked up. The nature of the unseemly devices employed is easily illustrated by the following excerpts from certain newspapers. One article, for example, hints unequivocally that ships carrying nuclear weapons will start putting "into the base." Another claim that appeared was that "as usual no sewers or purificatioon plant were envisaged."

Whether the leaders of the public organizations that spoke out "against the occupiers" expected it or not, representatives of the [border] district leadership came from Riga to meet them. And a meeting did take place. Activists of Sajudis and USSR People's Deputy V. Chyapas attended. I will not list all the border troops' arguments, I will dwell only on those issues that have been vigorously discussed in the press.

The claim that the border vessels carry nuclear weapons is untrue. If you want to convince yourself of this personally, be my guest. You talk about the lack of sewage purification facilities, but provision is made for them and one of the two branch pipes is being handed over to the city...

In general, the gauntlet was picked up. True, the border troops were politely reminded that the "the public will not renounce" their intentions and that "there is support from the city authorities." The discussion then developed as follows. Sajudis representives calmly made their forecasts. It's all the same it was stated, we will win the fall elections and then see whether we will employ you to protect the border zone or not. If need be, we will pay you. We are ready to return the R4 million spent on construction.

Answers were received. Completely frank ones. For all the apparent unusualness the clearly defined line adopted by Sajudis of late was discernible. Even if you disregard the concept of "their own army" put forward by some of its supporters, there is a great deal that is clear here: The mentality of isolation and divorce from statewide interests prevails.

The facility has been "frozen" for the time being. And the ships protecting the Lithuanian section of the economic zone travel in across hundreds of miles from other places.

Dialogue Essential

A few suggestions. A year ago the Klaypeda scenario would have developed as follows: No explanations at all from the military side and they would have continued building as before. It would merely have generated a new storm of protest.

But the range of political feelings in the Baltic does not fit into this black and white model. Despite the strong ideological discipline in the Latvian and Estonian People's Fronts and Lithuania's Sajudis, people remain people. It is only at rallies, as one political observer noted, that they are "fired by identical passions." But not everyone goes to rallies...

Contact with the public is important for the border troops. Therefore, for all the contradictoriness of the Klaypeda meeting's results, one should not put them down as a failure. That such contacts should have been embarked upon earlier, before it came to open confrontation, is another matter.

Back in April the USSR KGB Collegium examined the question of developing glasnost in the activity of its organs and troops. The collegium's decision envisages a broad spectrum of measures to increase openness and dialogue with a mass audience.

"It is now important for us to spread the experience built up in the best subunits," according to Major General V. Bubenin, member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Department of the Baltic Border District.

The simplest example. The A. Loshmanov outpost is in the [border] district's Estonian section. The All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol] members of it (and, incidentally, of the whole border detachment) have taken the elderly inhabitants of farms under their wing and help them as much as they can. Even the inscription on the gate by the buzzer to summon the border post duty officer is written in Russian and Estonian. A trifle, one might think. But if most of the farm inhabitants have a poor knowledge of Russian?

But there are nevertheless more problems than experience. A sergeant from the Latvian Red Riflemen outpost frankly acknowledged that the local inhabitants had been turning to them less often of late...

Three Lithuanian border troops stand in the doorway of the Lenin room. A Komsomol meeting was about to begin. They asked whether they could attend. There is nothing odd here, although they are Komsomol members. The Lithuanian Youth League recently detached itself from the All-Union Komsomol.

And here is a different kind of fact. An officer took away from a soldier a newspaper printed in his native language because of the publication's "criminal nature." The incident has been investigated at a meeting of the border district's Komsomol aktiv...

Life is life, and everything that happens in the [border] district is bound to be reflected in the military collectives' atmosphere. But the fact that the border troops are thinking about how to strengthen ties with the population is significant. As is the fact that at the same Klaypeda meeting agreement was reached in principle that environmental protection inspectors could fly in planes making reconnaisance flights out over the sea.

Despite Some "Whys"

It has already been said that it is difficult to overvalue the mass media's role in exceptional, contentious situations, and that is precisely what is arising increasingly in the region. I looked at the local press. What are they writing about the border troops. As a rule all the positive information, so to speak, converges on 28 May Border Troops' Day. While the rest of the time there is either silence or critical letters.

The Estonian newspaper, RAHVA HAAL, published a letter from K. Baynomyae in which he accuses border troops in the Khara area of poaching. When the Baltic Border District sent a reply (a commission started work), a correspondent went there to get to the bottom of the matter and saw for himself that the letter was a libel. Even the local inhabitants did not support Baynomyae.

Those same Klaypeda publications...

What, however, can be done to ensure that people in the republics know the truth about the border troops' service?

"We are planning to print issues of our own newspaper in three languages—Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian," Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Laktyushin, editor of the [border] district newspaper, NA SOVETSKIKH RUBEZHAKH, said regarding his plans.

"Our own printing press is not, of course, suitable for this (it just suffices to get our newspaper out on time), as the equipment is so obsolete. And we do not have Roman typeface. We will have to ask our journalist colleagues in the republics to help. Will they support the idea?"

Senior Lieutenant V. Chernous, a correspondent on NA SOVETSKIKH RUBEZHAKH, always calls in to youth publication editorial offices when in Tallinn and invites staffers to travel to the border. Complete freedom of information gathering is guaranteed. No one has said "no," but then virtually no one has said "yes" either to date...

Another solution is for the [border] district directorate to set up a press center. This is also being considered. But when the role of the press comes up, I recall one contradiction. Openness in the activity of the [border] district's troops is increasingly being felt. Young kids from Sweden traveled to the city of Rakvere border detachment outpost. Their impressions were good, the children enjoyed themselves. But we are unable to say in

our own newspapers exactly where the foreign visitors went—there are limitations. In short, yet another "why"...

It is time to turn to conclusions. Numerous meetings convincingly demonstrate how important it is for all of us to address common problems. There are no longer grounds for picketing the border zone. The border troops themselves, however, still do have questions...

Latest news: The newspaper, VECHERNIY TALLINN is publishing an article by E. Rannus, senior consultant at the republic Ministry of Justice on the need to close...Estonia's eastern border. It is possible to use the border troops to these ends, in his view. The proposal already has supporters. The question is: But won't this create yet another area of interethnic tension?

Kazakh Presidium Hits Baltic 'Separatist' Views

PM2009153189 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Sep 89 p 1

[KAZTAG report: "In the Name of Unity and the Strengthening of Friendship"]

[Text] In total support of the CPSU Central Committee statement on the situation in the Soviet Baltic republics, the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium has adopted, on behalf of the Kazakh and other peoples inhabiting our republic, an address to the Supreme Soviet Presidiums of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian SSR's expressing profound anxiety and alarm in connection with the events occurring there, which damage the historical friendship between the peoples of the socialist fatherland and the CPSU's Leninist nationalities policy and complicate the course of perestroyka.

Laws being adopted in the Soviet Baltic republics, which restrict the constitutional rights of a section of working people, are contrary to the accelerating process of democratization of social and state life and the concept of building a rule-of-law state, the address notes. Special concern is caused by the anti-Russian, separatist attitudes reflected in actions like that which took place 23 August this year, as well as by calls aimed against the Soviet system, the CPSU, and its leading role in the country's life and the society's revolutionary perestroyka.

The Presidium of Kazakhstan's supreme organ of state power reminds them that the Soviet federation is the result of a sociopolitical process and one of Great October's genuine gains. The union of the country's peoples has been proven during years of both peaceful building and grim trials. The peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have always displayed lofty Soviet patriotism and loyalty to the great ideals of socialist internationalism and national traditions. Actions by a section of the Baltic population with extremist leanings cannot but shake our respect for the Baltic peoples and erase the country's common past and the shared future of Soviet people.

The address contains a call for decisive and exhaustive measures to preserve the integrity of the Land of the Soviets and to do everything possible to overcome the crisis and create a calm labor atmosphere in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Communists, people's deputies, and all working people in the Baltic republics are called upon to display responsibility and wisdom and to find the strength and firmness not to yield to nationalist hysteria and to extricate themselves from the prevailing situation.

Bearing in mind that the processes occurring in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia affect the interests of all Soviet peoples, the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has asked the USSR Supreme Soviet to make full use of its great authority and constitutional rights to preserve the unity of the Soviet Union and to strengthen the friendship of peoples and the internationalist traditions of Soviet people.

Tajik Official on Readiness for 'Concessions'

LD1909231589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 19 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent M. Nikulin] For many decades people have lived in friendship and good-neighborliness in this fertile valley of the River Isfara in Kirghizia and Tajikistan. Owing to the small population, no problems arose between people. There was enough land and water for everyone. People did not pay any attention to who was in building what and where, whether it was on the territory of Kirghizia or Tajikistan. More than 30 years ago Tajikistan even handed over 140 hectares of its land to Kirghizia, but over the last 10 years there has been a sharp growth in the Tajik population in this area. Children are growing up and getting married, but there is nowhere to build anything. Economic questions have arisen, problems with finding work, the utilization of land and water.

Conflicts have started to arise between the inhabitants of Tajik and Kirghiz nationality, one of which led to a tragic outcome on 13 July. In a few villages a curfew was introduced, and the priority commission set up by the governments of Kirghizia and Tajikistan had to resolve the problems that had come to a head over the past 2 months. The set period has passed, but the commission has not produced a result that satisfies both republics. To resolve the social and economic problem, to eliminate the conflict situation, the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic is requesting that it be allocated 150-200 hectares from these several tens of thousands of hectares of a deserted valley belonging to the neighboring republic. Refusing this request, the Kirghiz side is proposing five small plots of land scattered along a river valley which is already overpopulated. In this event, in 2 or 3 years, problems

will arise anew. The commission holds sessions and debates, but the people are, at the same time, losing patience. Belief in a positive solution of the question is disappearing.

[Begin recording] [G. Savridinova, first secretary of Isfara Town Committee of the Tajik Communist Party] People are fed up with living in a constantly tense situation. Both we and our Kirghiz comrades must be ready to make concessions. One hundred hectares of land is not worth the life of even one person. We are requesting the USSR Supreme Soviet interfere and help to achieve the swiftest possible solution of our conflict, all the more so since two commissions, two groups of USSR people's deputies have visited us. I am convinced that the political wisdom of the leaders of the two fraternal republics will get the better of any emotions. [end recording]

[Nikulin] Surely the question of 200 hectares will not have to be resolved by the USSR Supreme Soviet because of ambitions and regionalist moods. The local authority is not in a state to resolve it itself. Thus, one would like to ask, "Can it be that we live in a single state?" [video shows landscapes and people, the commission in session, video interview with the Isfara first secretary]

Tajik KGB Party Meeting Held

PM2109124189 Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 8 Sep 89 p 2

[TADZHIKTA report: "At Tajik SSR KGB. Time of Great Changes"]

[Text] The question of developing glasnost in the activity of the republic's state security bodies was examined at a routine meeting of Communists from the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic KGB.

The Communists' speeches noted that perestroyka has touched all aspects of this department's activity under the changing conditions in the life of society and the state. It has set about boosting professionalism and strengthening its ties with working people. The party organization is also doing a great deal in this area.

At the same time information received by the republic's KGB convincingly shows that the arsenal used by foreign special services against our country in peacetime has by no means been stoppered. The reality is that, despite some easing of the international situation, the enemy is still making efforts to undermine and weaken our society. No one has abolished foreign states' special services. Moreover, considerable appropriations are being earmarked for their objectives.

In this connection the party meeting demanded that communist security officers pay more frequent visits to enterprises and organizations and make more active use of public forms of work: hold debates, conversations, press conferences, and "roundtables," at which they can talk about the change in the tactics of the special services' subversive actions and the forms and methods of their work.

The fact that lack of information for the population regarding the tasks and rights of state security bodies and the nature of their activity sometimes gives rise to distorted notions of security officers' work also dictates the need to strengthen multifaceted ties with working people. This situation is also aggravated by the fact that the mass media have of late featured a considerable number of statements regarding "intimidation by mythical agents." Party organizations within the Tajik KGB's intelligence, counterintelligence, investigative, and other subunits have been tasked with embarking more boldly on direct dialogue with a mass audience.

The party meeting emphasized that defense of Soviet citizens' constitutional rights and interests and the struggle to combat attempts by foreign anti-Soviet centers and organizations to undermine the moral and political potential of Soviet society and exacerbate and destabilize the situation within the country are a significant area in security work. They all aim to incite hostile actions on the part of anti-Soviet people within our society.

Thus, questions of improving the Soviet multiethnic federation have become exacerbated of late. Speculating on the problems, nationalist and extremist elements are stepping up their activity in a number of areas, including in Tajikistan. Outbreaks of nationalism and chauvinism share a common characteristic: By making extensive use of the slogans of democratization and glasnost, the extremists are trying by stealth and insinuations to make other nations and peoples shoulder the blame for the shortcomings in social and economic development. They are the source of appeals "to cleanse the area of 'newcomers'" and so on. And it is characteristic that many actions on the part of foreign special services targeted against our republic share this trait. The activity of the party's security officers in the events in Isfara, Kolkhozabad, Asht, and Kanibadam were analyzed at the meeting.

It was stressed at the party meeting that democratization, glasnost, and pluralism of opinion are the requisite conditions for the development and improvement of society. But when democracy and pluralism are seen as total license and a legal opportunity to combat the Soviet system and are used to encroach on the friendship of the peoples and the country's territorial integrity, no one should be in any doubt with regard to the KGB's stance. Strictly guided by existing legislation, security officers have upheld and will firmly uphold the position of defending the gains of socialism, the constitutional rights and interests of Soviet people.

The party meeting instructed the Tajik KGB party committee to regularly examine questions linked with expanding glasnost in the activity of security organs and deepen ties between the Committee's communists and the republic's labor collectives.

Scientific

'Mir' Scientists Complete Second Week of Tests

LD2109072489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0000 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Flight Control Center reports that cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov have completed the second week of orbital flight. The crew of the Mir scientific research complex continued on 20 September prophylactic work with the equipment and apparatus. During communication sessions, information from the scientific instruments and from the sensors mounted on the outer surface of the station was tranmistted to Earth. The cosmonauts also engaged in physical training exercises.

Kuybyshev Space Launch Design Bureau Visited

18660218 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 14 Sep 89 p 3

[Article by A. Vorobyev, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA correspondent: "'Photons' Are Born Here"]

[Text] Kuybyshev—Journalists have not passed through this entrance checkpoint, not yet designated by an official sign, for 30 years. That is exactly how old the central specialized design bureau is where launch vehicles of the "Vostok" and "Soyuz" type are developed.

A titanium mockup of one of these vehicles stands in the office of twice Hero of Socialist Labor Dmitriy Ilyich Kozlov, who is the chief designer of the TsSKB [Central Specialized Design Bureau], scientific manager of the KB [Design Bureau] "Photon," and a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

"This is the yesterday of our collective," he explains. "The theme for the design of launch vehicles is taken from plans. Conversion authoritatively dictates new directions in design thinking. We really did not have to rack our brains for a long time over what to produce for civilian use ["grazhdanka"]. The logic of life suggested: The theme is the same—outer space, and the designation of goals—peaceful....

Let us digress for a time from the main subject and introduce Kozlov for the first time to our wide circle of readers.

The editorial staff of the plant's newspaper POISK [SEARCH] showed me a copy of an interesting document, written with the clear handwriting of an engineer. It is called "Recommendation for candidacy to CPSU membership of Comrade Korolev, S.P." D. Kozlov, the chief designer of NII-88 [Scientific Research Institute] and the secretary of the party organization, recommends that Sergey Pavlovich Korolev be accepted as a member of the CPSU. "I have known Comrade Korolev, S.P. from our joint work since June of 1946. He showed himself capable of managing complicated design projects in a new field of technology." The document was dated 12 June 1953.

The path of the referrer was not easy in the famous design bureau. A student of the Leningrad Military Mechanical Institute in July 1941, he left to volunteer for the front, he was wounded three times in battles at Leningrad, and he lost his hand. He again returned to the institute, and he defended his candidate's dissertation.

And when a branch of "Korolev's OKB" [Test Design Bureau] was organized in Kuybyshev in 1959, D. Kozlov was appointed its manager and chief designer. Series production of launch vehicles was set up under his management at the base plant. After Yu. Gagarin's successful flight in 1961, Dmitriy Ilyich was awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labor.

Eight different modifications of launch vehicles were developed with the direct participation of D. Kozlov. While the first placed a one-and-a-half ton payload into orbit and had two stages, those that followed had three-four stages and carried a substantially greater payload.

"The creation of satellite explorers is our present task," Dmitriy Ilyich continues. "They serve a number of scientific directions: The 'Resurs-F's' [Resources-F's] execute the program 'IPRZ' (exploration of the Earth's natural resources) with the help of photography; the 'Photons' are intended for the implementation of technological operations under conditions of weightlessness; the 'Bions' [Biony] help scientists investigate the effect of weightlessness on the vital activity of the human organism."

A strong and cohesive collective has been set up in the TsSKB. Sixty doctors and candidates of technical sciences and nine Lenin prize laureates work here. Conversion did not make them unemployed. The lights are not turned off evenings in modest rooms with the signs "Control Systems Department," "Navigation Department," "Orientation Department," "Thermal Systems Department," "Correction Thrusters Department," and others. The workday here is a very relative concept.

Doctor of Technical Sciences and Hero of Socialist Labor Gennadiy Petrovich Anshakov, the first deputy manager of the TsSKB and deputy scientific manager of the "Photon" KB, shuffles through diagrams of the space laboratories that are on the table:

"You have before you an unmanned space apparatus 'Resurs-F.' Its main equipment is a wide-format camera for taking multizonal and spectrozonal images of 1:200,000 and with a resolution capability on the ground of about 5-6 meters. In addition, a special device—a sidereal camera—performs a coordinate referencing of the apparatus in outer space at the moment of picture-taking. In 10 minutes of operation the space apparatus furnishes a survey of a million square kilometers of the surface of the planet. After the completion of an orbital flight the film is returned to Earth in a descent apparatus."

Space vehicles are needed by almost all branches of the national economy. Applications for experiments are submitted not only by electronics specialists, but also by the USSR Minzdrav [Ministry of Health], and by metallurgy and other sectors. The designers have their own solid experimental base, where various systems of outer space vehicles are preliminarily worked on.

...Scrupulously clean, a brightly lit building with high ceilings. Engineer-Designer B. Bespalov shows us around his shop:

"This is 'Photon.' So to say, in its normal setup. Only its solar batteries are not deployed. We create artificial conditions of weightlessness on this test stand: The apparatus 'sits' on an air bearing, not touching the ground structure. Here we study system behavior.... And here is the stand for checking control systems for correction thrusters. There is a vibrostand in this 'compartment.' Preliminary testing reduces the cost of our articles."

The expressions "prime cost," "price," and "cost accounting" are heard time and again now in the conversations of the designers. The TsSKB is going over to cost accounting. And it has for the first time concluded contracts with firms in the FRG and in France. Some of the articles of these firms have already been in outer space. The comments of the foreign partners and the press have been enthusiastic.

"Our possibilities are enormous," D. Kozlov shares his thoughts with us. "Together with geodesists we can make map plans of any city and sector of the ground. An association of executors is already being set up. Algeria, Egypt, and Brazil have become interested in our proposals."

There is one more aspect of the activity of the TsSKB about which, unfortunately, few talk about. Dozens of excellent specialists have gone to work in other organizations in Kuybyshev Oblast. Among them is the rector of the institute, the managers of large departments of enterprises, etc.

Prominent specialists of the TsSKB give lectures in the aviation institute. Dmitriy Ilyich Kozlov is a professor, an outstanding lecturer, an active public man, and one of the managers of the scientific-technical council at the Kuybyshev CPSU obkom [oblast party committee].

The designers have large and realistic plans. The chief one of these is to make outer space matters profitable, and to debunk the opinion that space programs only suck money from the country and the people.

Need for Uzbek Nuclear Waste Plant Defended

PM190914018 9 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Sep 89 First Edition p 8

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent V. Artemenko and UZTAG correspondent Yu. Kruzhilin under the rubric "Reporter's Teletype": "Hiding Place for Atoms"]

[Text] Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic—No reporter has set foot here before. Certain data are still "closed." For example, we will not be naming the exact site of the unusual enterprise—the republic center for burying radioactive waste. We will merely say that it is far away from any housing, among bare hills covered with dried-up grass. And a specially laid asphalt road leads there.

Nor will we describe the work technology. We will only say that, on getting right up onto a bunker where radioactive waste is concealed together with a radiation supervisor, we switched on the measuring instrument. And it showed the level of radiation: almost 60 times below the norm. Of course, we will not describe how this place is guarded. We will say one thing: You would not envy those who might want to penetrate here with evil intent....

Why is such an enterprise needed? To answer this, let us recall just some of the tasks which nuclear physics helps to resolve today. Its "realm" includes far more than just nuclear electric power stations, which, since Chernobyl, arouse understandable alarm in people. Anyone who has not forgotten his school lessons knows that any chemical element has different forms—isotopes which can emit radioactive radiation. Isotopes are obtained with the help of nuclear reactors.

The list of applications for isotopes is a long one. But they gradually lose their strength. Their radiation grows weaker, although it persists to some extent for a long time. If handled carelessly, such a preparation can damage a person's health. So the need arises to reliably shield it from inexperienced hands until the radioactive atoms "burn out" entirely.

This is the task of the enterprise which we visited. It is, incidentally, economically accountable. Its workers and specialists use special transport to bring here spent sources of radioactive radiation from all over the republic and place them in stores constructed in accordance with the strictest protection measures. For a certain payment, dozens of organizations hand over small ampoules which have served their time. And here, among the hills, radioactive waste finds eternal repose in cleverly constructed shelters.

Nevertheless, the very existence of such an enterprise, which is extremely essential to the national economy, worries people. From time to time there are protests. We pondered with the specialists what the reasons are for this. And this is the conclusion we reached. The lack of information tells. The general public still does not know how everything is organized here, how minutely the radiation levels are checked, and how the protection measures are duplicated many times over.

Here are a few interviews.

F. Saydumarov, chief of the burial center: "There has not been a single accident or case of the radiation norms being exceeded in 20 years."

B. Rakhmatov, special vehicle driver: "I have been working here 10 years. I bring radioactive waste from all over Uzbekistan. I am 35 years old, married, with three children. My wife and parents are happy with my work. Our health is fine."

V. Vaynshteyn, Uzbek Health Ministry chief specialist in radiation safety: "Soil and plant samples are taken regularly from 20 places round about. Hydrogeologists study samples of underground water. Not once have analyses shown that permissible radiation levels have been exceeded."

That, in fact, is the entire story. So what about closing down the reactor? You should ask the 70,000 people suffering from cancer, jaundice, goiter, and heart diseases, who last year alone were screened with the help of radioactive preparations. Do they agree to the liquidation of 27 X-ray diagnostic subdepartments? To the closure of 30 laboratories for the early diagnosis of viral hepatitis?

Military

Military Helicopter Crashes in Uzbekistan

LD2109071589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0640 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Samarkand, 21 Sep, (TASS)—An MI-8 helicopter crashed Wednesday in Samarkand Oblast in the Soviet Central Asian Republic of Uzbekistan.

As N. Sattarov, deputy chief of the Internal Affairs Directorate of Samarkand Oblast, told a TASS correspondent, the disaster happened during an operation carried out by Militia in the Uzbek mountains to destroy poppy plantations used to make drugs.

A military helicopter was taking part in the operation. There were 15 people on board, including the crew. While landing, strong winds blew the craft and it hit rocks. People from the middle and tail section of the helicopter managed to escape. However, they were not able to help others inside the craft: A fire started and the helicopter exploded. Four people died.

Survivors were evacuated from the accident site. They are being given medical assistance.

Causes of the disaster are being investigated.

Yazov, Ligachev on Coping With Military Change

PM1909135089 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Sep 89 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the USSR Defense Ministry Collegium: Officer Cadres and Perestroyka"]

[Text] The processes of renewal in the USSR Armed Forces are developing and deepening in line with the general course of revolutionary changes in Soviet society. The assertion of a new moral and political atmosphere, the implementing of qualitative parameters in defense organizational development, the reduction of Soviet Armed Forces on a large scale, and the making of interethnic relations as a topical issue, bring to the fore the questions of fundamentally improving work with the officer corps. Above all, these issues bring to the fore the questions of restructuring the Armed Forces' consciousness, psychology, and understanding of the need for new approaches to resolve the tasks of training troops and ensuring their combat readiness.

These issues are of key significance to the life and activity of the Army and Navy. They were comprehensively examined on the broad political and socioeconomic plane, and with consideration for the nature of the times we are living through and the tasks for the longer term, at a recent enlarged session of the USSR Defense Ministry Collegium.

An important speech was delivered to the session participants by Army General D. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister.

A report was delivered by Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

The USSR defense minister's speech, the report, and the speeches by Army Generals D. Sukhorukov and V. Varennikov, Colonel Generals V. Rodin, V. Litvinov, and A. Kolinichenko, Admiral V. Panin, Major General of Aviation G. Venov, and Major General of Justice L. Zaik noted that the measures currently being taken in accordance with the demands of the CPSU Central Committee to fundamentally restructure military life and strengthen discipline, organization, and order in the Army and Navy are receiving approbation and support from officers. Military councils, political organs, and political command staff are seeking more effective ways and means to work with people. Negative phenomena in the troops' lives are being overcome. A new moral atmosphere, democracy, self-criticism in the assessment of results, and creative approaches to work are being asserted everywhere. All this is helping to ensure the a higher quality resolution of the tasks of maintaining the combat readiness of the Army and Navy, which is borne out by the inspections and checks carried out during last year and this year.

The Army and Navy officer corps—the USSR defense minister's speech, the report, and the other speeches stressed—properly understand and support the party course of deepening perestroyka in all spheres of the country's social life and in the sphere of military building. The Army and Navy have seen the decisions to undertake unilateral Armed Forces and arms cuts as an important step in further improving the international situation.

In the difficult sociopolitical situation prevailing in a number of the country's regions officers are showing political maturity, acquiring experience of the political

struggle against manifestations of extremism and nationalism, and ensuring healthy sentiments and cohesion among personnel.

At the same time, it was noted at the collegium, we cannot fail to see or react to the negative sentiments held by some of the officer corps, which are affecting attitudes about work and, ultimately, the quality of the fulfillment of assignments. The officer corps is not isolated from the people's life. Together with the people, it experiences the socioeconomic difficulties, the definite sluggishness of local political and economic reforms, and the complexity and acuteness of interethnic relations in several parts of the country.

Recently in the republics of the Soviet Baltic, the Transcaucasus, and Moldavia extremist elements have been doggedly shaping negative attitudes toward military cadres. There have been instances of officers being discriminated against in the provision of accommodation or residency permits. Instances of servicemen being physically attacked have become more frequent, as have threats against their families.

There are difficult problems associated with Armed Forces cuts. The turbulent politicization of our society has left its mark on the officer corps. Questions of the prospects for socialist building, the hist. y of our state, interethnic relations, the CPSU's leading role, and the restructuring of the working style and methods of the political vanguard have become topics for discussion.

The dissatisfaction of some officers with the processes impeding perestroyka in the Army and Navy, the unsophisticated organizational structure in certain formations and units, the lack of objectivity in assessing results of work, and the existence of wage leveling has also been noted.

We must self-critically admit, it was stated at the collegium, that certain leaders have been adopting a dual stance and permitting discrepancies between words and actions. While calling for work to be done according to the regulations, they have themselves been violating regulatory requirements. They point to the priorities of combat training, but divorce people from exercises. They call for a streamlining of officers' workdays and yet deprive them of days off. They issue directives and orders while emasculating the material and moral basis for them. They oppose wholesale punishments handed down to officers along the notorious "chain of command," but do everything the other way around....

There is a large group of problems associated with shortcomings in material and consumer conditions—problems which have a very tangible effect on people's morale and on the prestige of the officer service. The most acute problem is the housing problem. Most of the people without apartments are young families. There are also many weak spots with regard to the activities of support services. The exacerbation of the situation in the consumer market requires new approaches in the organization of the military trading system and food supplies. Our medical service also owes officers a better performance.

In certain areas some people have been trying to erode Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and the Army, and on the role of the Armed Forces in defending the socialist fatherland. Anti-Army statements have almost become the fashion in certain press organs, and on TV and radio. At the same time, nothing is said about the urgent problem in the country of the continuing threat of war, the need to maintain the Armed Forces' combat readiness, and the need for an attentive approach to the careers of servicemen discharged into the reserve, and to their families.

Officers' sentiments are also adversely affected by the not always efficient work of political organs and party organizations. Some of these bodies have lost the political initiative. They have turned in on themselves instead of really leading the situation in the officer corps. Discredited schemes, inertia, and isolation from people's real problems and concerns are being overcome extremely slowly.

Questions raised by life—the USSR defense minister's speech, the report, and the other speeches stressed—should be resolved swiftly and knowledgeably. The officer corps should operate more vigorously, enterprisingly, and boldly in the interests of perestroyka. With a view to further improving work with officer cadres—bearing in mind the current directives of the CPSU Central Committee, the decisions of the Congress of People's Deputies, and orders from the defense minister—the collegium adopted an enlarged resolution and ratified a plan for practical measures on the part of the USSR Defense Ministry and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. The decision was adopted to complete work on the USSR draft law on defense and other acts of legislation defining the basis of the organizational principles and development of the Armed Forces, and the rights, duties, and social protection of servicemen. Proposals are to be elaborated for the submission to the USSR Supreme Soviet of a draft law on the utilization of some of the funds released in connection with the USSR Armed Forces cuts to improve material and consumer provision for servicemen and their families. In particular, it is a question of measures to provide material incentives for vocational growth and better performances from officers, a bonus system for top-grade performance, combat standby and other forms of duty, 24-hour duty, and for work under extreme [ekstremalnyy] conditions, measures to reimburse spending on renting accommodation, and other measures.

Commanders of military districts, groups of forces, and fleets, commanders of categories of troops, chiefs of USSR Defense Ministry main and central administrations, commanders, and political organs have been apprised of the need to implement additional measures

to improve work with officer cadres, on whom the progress of perestroyka in the Armed Forces, the overcoming of stagnation, and the maintenance of combat readiness and military discipline at the appropriate level primarily depend.

Under current conditions military councils, commanders, political organs and staffs, and cadre and rear service organs are called upon to work more purposefully. They should resolve the difficult questions of the studies, service, and leisure of officers and their families more dynamically, and respond to their needs and requirements in a swift and timely fashion.

Qualitatively new approaches to the organization of all ideological and political education work with officer cadres have been mapped out. They propose closer attention to the fundamental tasks of Marxist-Leninist tempering, and the equipping of officers with the correct methodology for assessing events and phenomena in social life. Time demands that we anticipate events in our actions, forecast possible trends, sense the scale and nature of change and the pulse of sentiments in the military sphere, and shape those sentiments.

Commanders, political organs, and party organizations should pay particular attention to young officers. We must show paternal concern for them, promote their successful political and professional formation, and protect them against hasty or rash decisions.

We must arrange for constant political information for all categories of servicemen and extensively practice dialogue in political studies. It is recommended that the questions of the further democratization of party life be studied.

Perestroyka requires a radical change in our attitudes to letters and the organization of the reception of people on personal matters. Any approach to central organs or other authorities for help and assistance should offend the professional honor of local leaders and be seen as proof that they are isolated from their subordinates and have lost authority.

In the interests of improving the effectiveness and quality of the coverage of military-political issues and the life and activity of the USSR Armed Forces by the mass media, monthly press conferences will be held for workers from the central press, TV, and radio, and, if necessary, for foreign journalists too. It has been deemed expedient to set up a press center for the USSR Defense Ministry and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

The resolution reflects principled ideas about providing real opportunities for professional improvement, spiritual development, the streamlining of officers' worktime and pressure of work, the fair assessment of the results of combat work, and career development and training at Defense Ministry higher educational establishments. The improvement of the situation in the officer corps should also be pursued through further democratization and the expansion of glasnost in cadre work. We must resolutely eradicate subjectivism and favoritism, which, although often concealed, are seen as particularly unhealthy phenomena. During certification we must attentively investigate these processes. We must embark more boldly on expanding the rights and opportunities of the Officers' Assembly and standing certification commissions, and the participation of party committees and bureaus and All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League committees in cadre placement.

The revision of the "Provisions on Active Military Service by the USSR Armed Forces' Officer Corps," which will reflect the processes of the democratization of Army life and glasnost in cadre work and stipulate measures to step up the social protection of officers, and the rotation of service in various climatic and territorial zones and postings is nearing completion.

We should strive to ensure that all work to reduce the Armed Forces is clearly planned. Specific help should be given to discharged servicemen in finding accommodation, work, and a new place in life and society. A great deal in this respect depends on extensive explanatory work locally: in units, military colleges, military committees, and the mass media. Instructions have been given to work out the issues of privileges for servicemen, persons subject to military service obligation, persons discharged from military service, and their families, and to step up the legal and social protection for servicemen, the procedure for their joining housing constructive cooperatives, and guarantees for their family members' rights to residence permits, jobs, and other forms of social and material welfare at the location of the serviceman's posting. Instructions have also been issued for the progress of the implementation of the recently adopted USSR Council of Ministers resolution on measures to improve the provision of housing to servicemen discharged to the reserve or retired from the USSR Armed Forces to be studied.

We must instill the most stringent order in the registration and distribution of housing: A reliable barrier to abuses and excesses should be erected, and the public should be really involved in this sphere. Questions of priority, distribution, and upkeep of housing should be resolved out in the open, publicly, and in a party-minded, democratic fashion with sincere concern for people.

One of the most important areas of activity for military councils and political organs is the development and improvement of real links with local party and soviet organs, labor collectives, and social organizations in the interests of further strengthening the Army's unity with the people, improving mass defense and military-patriotic work among the population and personnel, and resolving the social and consumer questions faced by servicemen and their families.

The collegium resolution and the plan it ratifies for practical measures on the part of the Defense Ministry

and the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate also reflect other topical problems in further improving officers' ideological and theoretical tempering, democratizing the sociopolitical life of military collectives, enhancing staff organizational structures and the educational and training process, improving social, material, and consumer provision and cadre policy, and strengthening contacts with local party and soviet organs and social organizations.

Defense Official Discusses 'Afghan Lesson'

PM2009142989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[Open letter from Major General Kim Tsagolov, to the mother of a serviceman killed in Afghanistan: "'We Need the Whole Truth...'"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] First of all, I would like to say that everyone now feels it his duty to speak out "boldly" about Brezhnev's mistakes, which you yourself call "Brezhnev's delusions." Was it a mistake to take our forces in or not? This is a very difficult, complicated question. As is well known, complicated questions do not have simple answers. But we are now trying to give bold, straightforward answers easily, without any particular effort to understand the whole complex of factors leading to that decision. We now appear not to have a shadow of doubt about decisively saying that "Afghanistan was Brezhnev's mistake." But when I hear this, I begin to feel the gnawing worm of doubt. I am probably not alone in this—the tens and hundreds of thousands who went through the Afghanistan experience probably feel the same. What exactly are my doubts, and what is the subject of my agonizing deliberations? Why did Brezhnev take the decision? Someone must have briefed him on the situation in Afghanistan and someone must have analyzed the stormy events in that country, surely? The act cannot be seen as a sudden realization or as a decision made overnight. There was nothing "sudden" about it! It is now known that definite preparations were made to cross the Amu Darya long before December 1979. As early as spring 1979 our troops had marched to the border and... not crossed it. Why? What deterred the strategists of the Afghan campaign? What were their doubts?

My opinion is this: Those who gave unobjective information from Afghanistan are no less responsible than Brezhnev for the decision to introduce Soviet troops—a decision that had not been properly thought through. They were duty-bound to thoroughly investigate the events taking place, understand the disposition of conflicting forces, and appreciate the historical and religious traditions of the Afghan people. I very much doubt that the information sent from that country was either accurate or objective. So surely these officials are responsible for their irresponsible information, which was effectively misinformation with far-reaching strategic consequences? Of course, by this I do not mean to absolve either Brezhnev or other top leaders of their responsibility. No! But what I am saying is that they were not the only ones to blame for the doubtful decision to introduce troops. Also to blame were those of lower rank who, by virtue of their official position, made their own contribution to the preparation of this decision. That is my firm belief, as it is also my firm belief that they must be made answerable for this.

I will not accept the kind of talk whereby some now try to persuade others that they were opposed to the introduction of our troops at the time. I will not accept this kind of retrospective "bravery." There is a good Chinese saying: "There is nothing very brave about playing with the tail of a dead tiger." Some military commanders lacked the courage to "play" with the tail of the live tiger. Now, at least, this must be honestly admitted. It would be an act of civic courage. But if this was lacking at the time and is lacking now, if official cowardice was shown, there is no point in playing the brave spirit after the event.

Moreover, the discussion should be concerned with the need for official honor as well as official courage. Those who are now trying to portray themselves as "prophets" who did not agree with the decision taken by Brezhnev and Ustinov to introduce our troops should have handed in their resignation as a sign of disagreement and a point of official honor. This would have been honest, brave, and proper.

But if they did not do so, it is fair to conclude that these people lacked civic courage and honor. Fear of losing their prestigious positions "throttled" both courage and honor.

We will allow that that was then. But another question logically arises. Why, when the Afghan lesson had become patently obvious, when it was clear that there could be no military victory there, when the need to pull out our Soviet forces as quickly as possible had been discussed, and when any person with common sense should have tried not to continue and increase active combat operations but to save the lives of Soviet officers and men, why were the increasingly active combat operations involving our troops continued? Why were our servicemen still dying at that time? I would allow even this, if harsh necessity had forced our "brave" military commanders to save the official government from an overt, direct threat. But if this was not the case, why was it necessary to carry out a "grandiose" operation involving Soviet servicemen to accompany food convoys to Khowst, for example? Could the Afghan Army not have done that as well as we?

The Afghan Army's experience of combat operations without our participation since the withdrawal of Soviet military units has shown that they know how to fight without the support of our troops. Throughout the ages, military commanders have known that they not only have to think of the results but also of the price that has

to be paid for those results. So, who should be responsible for the losses which we incurred before and after the decision was made to withdraw our troops? What, no one? I do not agree with that. Where are the people who have received hero stars but not answered for the price at which those stars were attained?

A great deal has been written and still is being written about Afghanistan. In my view, it is often not the truth. But a lie cannot console those who paid such a heavy price for that ill-considered step. A lie does irreparable damage. It maims the soul and shatters people's state of mind. I stress: The whole truth is needed. Everyone needs it: the living and the dead.

Now about another aspect of the matter. Many people are now trying to claim that our men died for nothing in Afghanistan. I cannot agree with that! Surely our servicemen made a worthy contribution to the cause for which sovereign, democratic Afghanistan is now struggling? Is that really acting in vain?

But we should listen to the opinions of the internationalist servicemen themselves. Perhaps they, who have known the joy of military success and the pain of loss and have drenched the dusty roads of Afghanistan with their soldier's blood and sweat, feel that they served in vain, died because of a mistake, and endured those hardships to no advantage? I am confident that the majority of the internationalist servicemen do not think that way. Before their eyes and in their memories, Afghanistan is a tortured, extremely poor country whose people are filled with suffering and hope. And every internationalist serviceman is proud that he has played at least some small part in the fate of this intelligent, proud, and industrious nation. No, I am not asking for our servicemen to be showered with flowers and have a fanfare trumpeted from the house-tops. But it is the duty of society and every one of us as individuals to treat them with pride, reverence, and respect.

The pain of the mothers, widows, and children of the servicemen who died in Afghanistan is immeasurable. Their grief is immeasurable and their loss irreparable. But to do as some of our newspapers and journals are doing and say that their loved ones died because of a mistake is blasphemy against their unhealed wounds and against the memory of those who bowed their heads and honorably did their duty as soldiers.

I would like to express another idea. It has now become fashionable to throw rocks at the Army. One gets the impression that there is some kind of competition to see who can wound the Army most painfully and defame it the most. This epidemic has also affected the "Afghan" servicemen. You often hear people say: "What's heroic about what they did there? They lost the war, after all." As a result, the "Afghan" servicemen have emerged from the flames of war only to find themselves in another war—a moral war.

I cannot agree with this. No, our Soviet servicemen did not lose the war. They did their duty and made a dignified retreat. Our servicemen completed the overwhelming majority of their military engagements successfully. But if we are going to talk about any failure in the Afghan operation, it is on the conscience of the politicians. Again and again the question arises: Did we do right in going into that country? This must be carefully investigated. That is why I resolutely support our Supreme Soviet in its endeavors to get to the heart of every aspect of the Afghan problem, gain an understanding of it, and speak honestly about the lessons to be learned, however harsh and bitter they may be.

Finally, one more point: Concern for the dead and wounded. There is no point in hiding it: As far as some people are concerned, Afghanistan was the place where they "earned" a military award without accomplishing any special feat. For some, it was a springboard to a new, higher post. Again, without any special merit. But, after all, there is no such thing as a war without human casualties. So, for many, Afghanistan meant they had to pay the very highest price: their life, sealed in a zinc coffin. And, for even more servicemen, it has meant a mutilated future. It has meant an inconsiderate, inhuman attitude, sometimes even outrage with their bitter fate. The coffin containing the body of Vadim Abidenko could not be sent home from Tashkent, because there were no tickets. The officer accompanying the coffin, who had studied together with Vadim, was forced to do some work at the dacha of someone who worked at Tashkent airport in order to get a ticket, that way at least, and be able to send the coffin to its destination.

What can I say about that? What justification can possibly be found for such extreme callousness? What overwhelming emotions that man must have felt! There are no limits to the sense of outrage and insult and no words to express them.

But even here I wonder about the irresponsibility of the officials responsible for the fate of the "Afghan" servicemen. Just like that inhuman airport worker, they forgot their official, human duty to the memory of those who died. They were unable or unwilling to do what they were officially obliged to do. No! It is not the fatherland that is to blame in this revolting case. The insult is the responsibility of those bureaucrats for whom nothing is sacred any more. Not only the insult, but also the demand for the harsh punishment of such actions.

I have already had occasion to say that every serviceman who died deserves to be spoken of not as one of many who died but personally, by name. And it would not have hurt the big military commanders if notification of the death of a soldier or officer in Afghanistan had been signed not by an unknown, unknowing military commander but by those whose orders the serviceman had been carrying out when he was killed. No, no one can return a son to his mother from the dead. That is how it is. But a mother who receives a letter from an important military commander with warm words about her dead son and with kind sympathy and sorrow would have a

sense of pride for her son, for his efforts, and for his achievements as consolation for her inconsolable grief. [Passage omitted]

Military, Party Officials Meet in Transcaucasus

PM2009153389 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 30 Aug 89 p1

[Georgian News Agency: "In Interests of Joint Harmonious Work"]

[Excerpts] The state of work with officer cadres and measures to further improve this work in light of present requirements were discussed at a sitting of the Red Banner Transcaucasus Military District Military Council held in Tbilisi. The following took part in the work of the sitting: G.G. Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee; N.A. Chitanava, chairman of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers; A.N. Mutalibov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers; and O.I. Lobov, second secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee.

A broad circle of command-political personnel from the military district took part in the debate on the report given by Colonel General V.A. Patrikeyev, commander of the Transcaucasus Military District. The sitting was addressed by Lieutenant General A.N. Novikov, member of the Military Council and chief of the Transcaucasus Military District Political Directorate, and G.G. Gumbaridze.

In his speech the leader of the republic's party organization stressed, in particular, that Georgia's party organs and Communists see their main task as being to stabilize the situation in the republic as far as possible and consolidate all social forces on the basis of constructive dialogue and the establishment of complete mutual understanding and joint action. When a very tense situation has taken shape in some regions, such as Abkhazia and Kvemo Kartli, every effort has been made by party, soviet, and administrative

An important role in the elimination of many negative phenomena has been played by the decision of the USSR Defense Ministry to substantially increase the contingent of draftees doing military service within the republic and the Transcaucasus Military District. The broad public approves of the USSR Supreme Soviet decision to release students at higher education establishments from military service and return them to the lecture halls for the start of the academic year. [Passage omitted]

In conclusion, Comrade Gumbaridze expressed confidence that the military district's Military Council and Georgia's party organizations will join forces and do everything possible to restore and deepen the traditional ties between the army and the working people, that mutual restraint, mutual assistance, and mutual responsibility will always be shown so that there can be no cause for undesirable phenomena, and that, as before, we will resolve together the very important tasks set by our party at the present stage of our historical development.

Defense Ministry Lists Articles for Civilian Use

LD2009100289 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 20 Sep 89

[Text] The USSR's Defense Ministry has offered a list of articles worth R500 million which can be used for civilian programs. The list consists of 1900 names of various machines and equipment announced for sale to industrial plants, cooperatives, and individuals. This is the first portion of manufactures released as the result of cuts in Soviet Armed Forces. Besides, several thousand tanks would be converted into (?tough) vehicles, bulldozers, and practice equipment.